DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 984 RC 009 762

AUTHOR	Lopez, Ronald W.; And Others
TITLE	Chicanos in Higher Education: Status and Issues. Chicano Studies Center Publication, Monograph No. 4.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Chicano Studies Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	220p.; Prepared as a resource document for the Symposium on the Status of Chicanos in Higher Education (Los Angeles, California, May 1975)
AVAILABLE FROM	Chicano Studies Center-Publications, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90024 ($10.00) payable to the University of California Regents
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	College Freshmen; *College Students; Declining Enrollment; Dental Schools; *Educational Problems; Educational Status Comparison; Educational Trends; *Enrollment; Enrollment Trends; Ethnic Distribution; Graduate Students; *Higher Education; Law Schools; Literature Reviews; Medical Schools; *Mexican Americans; National Norms; *Professional Education; Puerto Ricans; Racial Distribution; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS	*Chicanos; Spanish Surnamed

ABSTRACT

Compiled to provide a national picture of Chicanos in higher education, this report provides a profile of Chicanos in higher education, with emphasis on enrollment patterns. Based on census and Office of Civil Rights data, the data are mainly for 1970, although information for other years both before and after 1970 is also included. Information pertains to: the response of higher education to Chicanos; Chicano representation in higher education; issues facing Chicanos in higher education (access, retention and attrition, faculty, administration, funding, instruction and curriculum, Chicano Studies, research, and survival); the eligible population; undergraduate and graduate enrollment; enrollment by fields of study; and brief case studies of select institutions. The data indicates that Chicanos are under-represented at all levels of higher education. The proportional representation of Spanish-surnamed people declines the higher the level of education. Relatively higher percentages of Chicano enrollment are found in Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas which have the highest percentages of Chicanos in the general population. High percentages of Spanish-surnamed people are also found in the educational institutions of Florida and New York where the Cuban and Puerto Rican populations respectively are concentrated. These 7 states accounted for 83% and 80% of all Spanish-surnamed enrollment in higher education in 1970 and 1972 respectively. (NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED136984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

R. Cruz for Chicano
Studies Center

2

CHICANOS IN HIGHER EDUCATION:

STATUS AND ISSUES

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Ronald W. López

Research Consultant in Education and Mass Media, formerly Director of Chicano Studies, Claremont Colleges. Received his Master of Arts in U.S. history from UCLA. Mr. López is currently consulting on a variety of projects and is functioning as a California State Inheritance Tax Referee.

Arturo Madrid-Barela

Director of the Ford Foundation Graduate Fellowships Program for Mexican Americans, Native Americans and Puerto Ricans (1975-76), received his Ph.D. in Spanish from UCLA. Dr. Madrid is Associate Professor of Latin American and Chicano Literature, and Chairman of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Minnesota.

Reynaldo Flores Macías

Co-Editor of Aztlán-International Journal of Chicano Studies Research received his B.A. in Sociology at UCLA and his M.A. in Education from that same institution. At present he is completing a doctorate in Socio-linguistics from Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

CHICANOS IN HIGHER EDUCATION:

STATUS AND ISSUES

Prepared by:

Ronald W. López

Arturo Madrid-Barela

Reynaldo Flores Macías

for

The National Chicano Commission
on Higher Education

Monograph No. 7

Chicano Studies Center Publications

University of California, Los Angeles

405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, California

© Copyright 1976 by Ronald W. López, Arturo Madrid-Barela, and Reynaldo Flores Macías. All rights reserved under Pan American and International Copyright Conventions. Printed in El Pueblo de Nuestra Señora La Reina De Los Angeles de la Porciúncula, California, Aztlán, USA.

Contents

		Page
	List of Tables	vii
	Preface	xv
	Acknowledgments	xix
	Symposium on the Status of Chicanos in Higher Education: Steering Committee and Participants	xxi
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Data Sources, Qualifications and Limitations	5
	Brief Review of the State of the Literature	5
	Data Sources for this Document	7
	Problems of the Data	7
	Importance of Representational Analysis	12
III.	The Status of Chicanos in Higher Education	15
	The Response of Higher Education to Chicanos	15
	Chicano Representation in Higher Education	19
	Issues Facing Chicanos in Higher Education	24

Page

IV. A Profile of Chicano Participation in Higher Education 35

The Eligible Population 35
Undergraduate Enrollment 42
Graduate Enrollment 85
Brief Case Studies of Select Institutions 126

Conclusion 157

Appendixes 163

Table 50 - Full-Time Graduate School Enrollment 1972 - State Summaries 165
Table 51 - Full-Time Professional School Enrollment 1972 - State Summaries . . .168

Selected Bibliographies on Chicanos in Higher Education . . .171

Tables

No. Page

1 - Race and Ethnic Distribution of the U.S. Population by Age Group, 1970 37

2 - Race and Ethnic Distribution of the U.S. Population by Age Group, 1970 - Percentage Distribution . . . 38

3 - 18-24 Year Olds as a Percentage of the Total Race and Ethnic Populations, 1970. 38

4 - Percentage of Individuals Enrolled in School by Age Group and Race, 1970 42

5 - U.S. Undergraduate Enrollment, Full-time: All Institutions and Publicly and Privately Controlled Colleges and Universities, 1970 . . 44

6 - Spanish-surnamed Enrollment in All Public and Private Institutions of Higher Education, 1970 - Percentage Distribution 47

No. Page

7 - Historical Comparison - U.S. Undergraduate Enrollment, Full-time, 1968, 1970, 1972 - All Institutions 49

8 - Historical Comparison - U.S. Graduate and Undergraduate Enrollment Full-time, 1968, 1970, 1972 - All Institutions 50

9 - Weighted National Norms for Chicano and Puerto Rican American Freshmen, 1971-1974 53

10 - Range of Mean Test Scores for Entering Students by Selectivity of Institutions of Higher Education 55

11 - Selectivity Levels of Public and Private Universities - Chicano and Puerto Rican American Enrollment by Sex 57

12 - Selectivity Levels of Public and Private Four-Year Colleges - Chicano and Puerto Rican American Enrollment by Type of College 58

No. Page

13 - Undergraduate Enrollment, Full-time in Institutions of Higher Education, State Summaries, 1970 62

14 - Rank Order by Percentages of Spanish-surnamed Undergraduate Enrollment by State, 1970 65

15 - Undergraduate Enrollment, Full-time in Institutions of Higher Education, State Summaries, 1972 67

16 - Rank Order by Percentages of Spanish-surnamed Undergraduate Enrollment by State, 1972 70

17 - Enrollment by Year of Attendance in Institutions of Higher Education, 1970, Select States . . . 73

18 - Rank Order by Percentage of Spanish-surnamed First and Fourth Year and Total Undergraduate Enrollment by Select States, 1970 80

No. Page

19 - Rank Order by Percentage of Spanish-surnamed Total Undergraduate Enrollment by Select States, 1970, 1972 82

20 - U.S. Enrollment by Field of Study, Graduate and Undergraduate, 1972 86

21 - U.S. Enrollment by Field of Study, Spanish-surnamed, 1972 . . . 87

22 - Summary Graduate and Professional School Enrollment for Spanish-surnamed and Others, 1970 90

23 - Summary Graduate and Professional School Enrollment for Spanish-surnamed and Others, 1972 90

24 - Graduate and Professional Enrollment as Percent of Undergraduate 92

No. Page

25 - Full-time Graduate and Professional School Enrollment (Except Medical, Dental and Law Schools) 1970, State Summaries . . . 93

26 - Rank Order by States of Highest Spanish-surnamed Graduate Enrollment Percentage and Percentage Enrollment Most Closely Approximating Spanish-surnamed Population Percentage, 1970 98

27 - Rank Order by States of Highest Spanish-surnamed Graduate and Professional School Enrollment Percentage and Percentage Enrollment Most Closely Approximating Spanish-surnamed Population Percentage, 1972 98

28 - Graduate School Full- and Part-time Enrollment by Field of Study for Various Ethnic Groups, 1970 101

29 - Enrollment in Ph.D. - Granting Institutions, 1973 102

No. Page

30 - Percentage Distribution of Spanish-surnamed Graduate Students by Field of Study, 1973 103

31 - Doctorate Awarded, 1972-1973 by Field Native-Born U.S. Citizens 105

32 - Percentage Distribution by Field Among 1973 Doctorate Recipients 106

33 - First Year and Total Enrollments in Medical Schools 1970-1971 to 1974-1975 110

34 - Graduate School Enrollment in Medical Schools by Ethnic Group . .111

35 - Medical School Enrollment - Full-time, 1970, State Summaries 113

36 - Graduate School Enrollment in Dental Schools for Various Racial and Ethnic Groups 116

No. Page

37 - Dental School Enrollment - Full-time, 1970, State Summaries 118

38 - Law School Enrollment for Spanish-surnamed Individuals and Others, 1970-1974 121

39 - Law School Enrollment - Full-time, 1970, State Summaries 124

40 - Rank Order of Spanish-surnamed Law School Enrollment by Number and Percentage of Law School Enrollment by State, 1970 126

41 - University of California Survey 1968-1973 128

42 - Chicanos at University of California at Berkeley by Degree Goal, 1974 - as Percentage of Chicano Graduate Enrollment 138

43 - Chicanos at University of California at Berkeley by Field of Study 1973, 1974 138

44 - Chicanos in California State University and Colleges 141

No. Page

45 - Field of Study Distribution for Chicanos in California State University and Colleges, 1973 145

46 - Chicano Graduate Enrollment at Stanford University 147

47 - Chicanos as Percentage of Total Graduate Enrollment at Stanford, 1973 147

48 - Chicano Enrollment University of Texas, Austin - by School or College, 1974 152

49 - Spanish-surname Enrollment in Graduate School, University of Texas, Austin, 1974 153

50 - Full-time Graduate School Enrollment 1972, State Summaries . . .165

51 - Full-time Professional School Enrollment 1972, State Summaries . .168

Preface

In January of 1974 Abel Amaya, who was at the time a Program Officer in the Division of Education and Research, The Ford Foundation, commented to a group of Chicano academics serving as the selection committee for the Ford Foundation Graduate Fellowships for Mexican Americans that Chicanos were greatly handicapped in their struggle to improve their educational situation as a result of the lack of information on Chicanos in higher education on a national level and due to the absence of a national organization which had as its primary concern the status of Chicanos in higher education. That lack of information and the need for a national organization which might address itself to the matter became rather acute to me in May of 1974, when Abel Amaya arranged a meeting between officers of the Division of Education and Research of the Ford Foundation and a number of Chicano academics and academic administrators in Denver, Colorado. At stake were questions of Ford Foundation policy planning in the area of minority education and the Foundation's decision to farm out the Graduate

Fellowship Programs for Mexican Americans, Native Americans, and Puerto Ricans. None of us present in Denver at that meeting had information which showed what the status of Chicanos in higher education was at the moment, or what the shape of the future would be. Clearly and painfully lacking was a Chicano organization which was dedicated to that purpose or which had the expertise, experience, and capability of assuming responsibility for administering the Graduate Fellowship Programs.

As a result of that meeting in July of 1974 I submitted a proposal to the Ford Foundation requesting a grant for the purpose of holding a conference to discuss the major issues facing Chicanos in Higher Education and to explore the possibility of creating a national organization which could address itself to those issues. This proposal was approved and funded by the Ford Foundation for a six month grant period beginning December 1, 1974. As called for in the proposal the Steering Committee met to set the date and site for the conference, to select the participants, and to make some decisions with respect to the nature of the meeting. In a

departure from the original proposal it was decided to commission a report on the status of Chicanos in higher education rather than to solicit position papers. The report would be distributed to the participants before the meeting and would provide a basis for discussion and for any decisions which might be taken with respect to a national organization. Ron López, a well-known educational consultant from the Los Angeles area, was selected to prepare the report.

The Symposium on the Status of Chicanos in Higher Education took place in Los Angeles on May 10, 1975. The participants discussed the report and the issues facing Chicanos in higher education. The need for a national organization was recognized and the participants voted to constitute themselves as the National Commission on Chicano Higher Education. The Commission then authorized the creation of an Executive Committee and charged it with incorporating the Commission as a nonprofit corporation and with preparing a proposal to be submitted to various agencies for funding. This charge was for the period of one year.

The present report is an edited and synthesized version of the original and is being published in the interests of sharing information with those persons concerned about the status of Chicanos in higher education. As Ron López indicates in his preliminary remarks, it should be understood that this report is first and foremost a resource document which provides information on the status of Chicanos in higher education and a bibliography of where that information can be obtained. Because it was commissioned on short notice and prepared in record time it does not involve original research and should be viewed principally as an introduction to the subject.

Arturo Madrid-Barela

Chairman, Executive Committee of the National Chicano Commission on Higher Education

Director, Graduate Fellowships Program for Mexican Americans, Native Americans and Puerto Ricans; Educational Testing Service

Acknowledgments

The publication of this report was made possible by funds provided by the Ford Foundation for the Symposium on the Status of Chicanos in Higher Education. Special note is taken here of the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, which administered the grant at no charge.

The support and counsel of Abel Amaya is gratefully acknowledged here, as are the services of María Baeza and Teresa McKenna in editing this document and preparing it for publication. Thanks also to Carlos Arce for the information and bibliographic materials he so generously provided. For the aid and support of the UCLA Chicano Studies Center, especially that of Roberto Cabello Argandoña and the Chicano Studies Research Library whose bibliographic search was essential to the development of this document, we give our sincerest appreciation.

R.W.L.
A.M.B.
R.F.M.

Production

Rosa Martinez Cruz, Publications Coordinator
Dr. Carlos Haro
Roberto Cabello-Argandoña
Alicia Teichman
Dora Torres

Photographs compliments of
Sin Fronteras Newspaper

Symposium on the Status of Chicanos in Higher Education

Steering Committee

Arturo Madrid-Barela, Chairman
Director, Graduate Fellowships Program for Mexican Americans, Native Americans and Puerto Ricans; Educational Testing Service

Carlos Blanco Aguinaga
Professor, Department of Literature
University of California, San Diego

Eugene Cota-Robles
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of California, Santa Cruz

Richard Griego
Professor, Department of Mathematics
University of New Mexico

Juan Gómez-Quiñones
Associate Professor of History
Director, Chicano Studies Center
Co-Editor, Aztlán-International Journal of Chicano Studies Research
University of California, Los Angeles

Carlos Muñoz
Assistant Professor
Program in Comparative Culture
University of California, Irvine

Adaljisa Riddell
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
University of California, Davis

Participants

Frank Angel
President Emeritus
New Mexico Highlands University

Alonso Atencio
Assistant Dean of Students
School of Medicine
University of New Mexico

Pedro Castillo
Assistant Professor of History
Yale University

Carlos Cortés
Chairman, Mexican American Studies
Associate Professor of History
University of California, Riverside

Ismael Dieppa
Associate Dean
School of Social Welfare
University of Denver

Adalberto Guerrero
Chairman, Mexican American Studies
University of Arizona

Manuel Guerrero
Chairman, Department of Chicano Studies
University of Minnesota

Rolando Hinojosa
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Texas A & I University

Mari Luci Jaramillo
Professor, Department of Elementary Education
University of New Mexico

Richard Pesqueira
Vice President of Student Affairs
New Mexico State University

Cecilia Preciado de Burciaga
Assistant to the President
Provost for Chicano Affairs
Stanford University

Jacinto Quirarte
Dean, College of Fine Arts
University of Texas, San Antonio

Tomás Rivera
Associate Dean, College of
Multi-Disciplinary Studies
University of Texas, San Antonio

Manuel Ramírez
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology
University of California, Santa Cruz

Teresa de Shepro
Vice-Provost
University of Wasnington

I

Introduction

This report was initially prepared as a resource document for the Symposium on the Status of Chicanos in Higher Education, which was held in Los Angeles in May of 1975. The Symposium was sponsored by the Ford Foundation through a grant to Dr. Arturo Madrid-Barela, Director of the Ford Foundation Graduate Fellowships Program for Chicanos, Native Americans and Puerto Ricans. The report was to provide the Symposium participants with basic information on the status of Chicanos in higher education across the country in order to facilitate discussion of the principal issues which face Chicanos in higher education.

The report presents a general context for the study of the status of Chicanos in higher education, describes the existing data base, addresses some of the data problems involved in making such a study, and provides a profile of Chicanos in higher education with particular emphasis on enrollment patterns. In setting up the context for the data, numerous issues and concerns affecting Chicanos in the area of higher education are enumerated

and discussed. The discussion of these issues touches only the surface of the subject matter. As is frequently indicated in the text, the intent of this report is more to identify the principal issues than to attempt to resolve or argue specific solutions for them.

The issues, like the data, have a national rather than local frame of reference. The informed reader will find that some issues which would appear to be critical issues are not included and some which are included seem unrelated to local situations. This is partly because of a basic attempt to develop a national scope and partly the result of the limitations imposed by the data. Given the limited resources available and the deadline imposed by the Symposium date and the grant period it was not possible to make any special surveys. As a result, the report is confined to the data that was readily available.

Special consideration should be called to the fact that there is no single source of information that provides easily accessible enrollment figures on Chicanos in higher education. For this reason and in line with the

overall intent of the report, data is provided in a multitude of forms and breakdowns. The reliability of the data is discussed in the text. Suffice it to say that the data used in this report is as accurate as any data available for the national picture.

Another important consideration to be noted is that there are many issues and areas of concern for which there is no available national data. The subject of retention/attrition, for example, has not been studied on a national level. There are many similar voids in other areas. It is hoped that the gaps in knowledge revealed by this report will stimulate substantive research into those issues concerning Chicanos in higher education.

II

Data Sources, Qualifications and Limitations

Brief Review of the State of the Literature

A quick glance at the bibliography provided herein will give the reader an idea of the amount and scope of materials concerning Chicanos in higher education. Those readers who are familiar with Chicanos in higher education as a research subject will notice that while the resources are beginning to increase and that although substantive investigation of some topics has been undertaken in doctoral dissertations in recent years, the body of literature is still limited. The most important reason for this is that Chicanos are a very recent phenomenon in higher education. As late as 1968 most campuses had no Chicanos enrolled and those campuses in areas of Chicano population concentration had as few as five or six enrolled.

Within the existing literature there are some recurring subjects. Perhaps the principal one involves the question of why Chicanos are not represented in higher education. One point of view holds that Chicanos are in a disadvantageous situation with respect to

1 + cpyt'd photo

higher education because of deficiencies in their preparation. Another view focuses on economic factors as an explanation for that condition. A very frequent subject is the problem of recruitment and admissions. The matter of retention/attrition is also frequently addressed, as is also the question of Chicano performance on various "objective" tests.

There are, however, other problems beyond the paucity of materials. Much of the material is not readily available, since it takes the form of master's theses, doctoral dissertations, symposium, conference, or congress papers, and "in-house" or limited-circulation institutional reports. The available materials are principally highly specific articles dealing with local or regional problems and situations and have a very limited data base. There does not exist a general study which introduces the subject, identifies the various areas, or indicates the existing sources of information. Nonetheless, the existing materials not only indicate the need for research with respect to the status of Chicanos in higher education, but also point out the directions this research must take.

Data Sources for This Document

This document was compiled to provide the basis for a national picture of Chicanos in higher education. The information presented here is either directly or indirectly based on Census and Office of Civil Rights data. This information should be viewed as an introduction to the status of Chicanos in higher education. No in-depth interviews were conducted nor were new surveys initiated. The report is limited to the existing information available. The bibliography appended was compiled from several bibliographies and from computer searches for dissertation titles and unpublished works.

Problems of the Data

The data on the status of Chicanos in higher education presented here has the specific intent of illustrating in general terms the presence of Chicanos in higher education. This data provides only a representative picture. There is no attempt to be totally comprehensive nor is there any attempt to delve deeply into the issues. The objective here is limited to showing basic information such as national enrollment figures at both the

undergraduate and graduate levels as well as supplementary data showing distribution both by academic field and geographic area. The bulk of the data is for 1970 although there is also information for other years both before and after 1970. The readily available 1970 data allows for a more detailed view of Chicano enrollment characteristics and is the base data for the undergraduate figures in particular. The historical data that is presented for overall undergraduate enrollment has a different sampling base than the 1970 data with the result that there are instances where figures do not match. Where appropriate, this data is given in a separate paragraph with accompanying qualifications.

Although the quantitative data presented here does not pretend to absolute and complete accuracy, the patterns and trends revealed by the available statistics are difficult to refute. For example, the 1970 Chicano population in graduate schools was 1.2%. There would have to be a seven to ten percent error in the absolute number of Chicanos (with no change in total enrollment) for the Chicano percentage to change one tenth of one percent. It is unlikely that

there is an error of sufficient magnitude to significantly alter the relative representation.

Research on Chicanos in higher education invariably requires several qualifications. Clarification of nomenclature is primary. Although the term Chicano continues to mean different things to different people in different places, in this study it is used interchangeably with Mexican American and Spanish-surnamed. The reason for this is that some of the data used for this study was acquired from sources which indiscriminately identify people as Spanish-surnamed, as Chicano, or as Mexican American. In those instances where people are clearly identified as Cuban or Puerto Rican or Latin American (other than Mexican), distinctions will be made. Data presented in tabular form indicate the nomenclature used for the data acquisition.

There are other qualifications that must be mentioned. Office of Civil Rights data has distinct advantages in that the same questionnaire was used across the country, but disadvantages in that each institution was allowed to define the racial and ethnic

composition of their student population. The primary "problem" with the Census data is that the basis for these figures is a sample of the sample population and there is strong feeling that the Spanish-surnamed figures are generally low and urban-biased. Moreover, respondents were able to indicate more than one description. Thus the Spanish-surnamed category is likely to have some duplication. However, discrepancies discovered by Urban Education Inc. in their study (Minority Enrollment and Representation in Institutions of Higher Education; A Survey of Minority Student Enrollment in Colleges, Universities, Graduate Schools and Professional Schools in 50 States and The District of Columbia, Commissioned by The Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y., 1973), show that while Spanish-surnamed figures are often inconsistent (depending on the source), the differences were minimal.

A most important qualification is that any count of Chicanos or Spanish-surnamed is likely to be low and the greatest error is likely to occur in the general population characteristics. This means, of course, that

Chicanos may be even more greatly under-represented in institutions of higher education than the data reflects. Also, the reader must keep in mind that the low representation of Chicanos in institutions of higher education renders moot most discussion of the accuracy of the data. As has already been mentioned, the magnitude of the error in the Chicano figures would have to be very large to alter the percentages even slightly. Furthermore, the error would have to be even larger to change global trends or patterns. One can conclude, therefore, that the percentages shown can be used with reasonable confidence and that the emergent patterns or trends merit even more confidence.

Limits or gaps in the data also present a problem. The 1970 Census was the first effort to identify Chicanos since 1930. No serious effort to identify Chicanos in higher education on a national scale occurred until after the Civil Rights Act. Today, data developed by or for the Office of Civil Rights is probably the only attempt at a systematic national count other than the Census. Other attempts are normally done through sampling processes that begin with a limited universe.

Thus, while the data has multiple limitations there are no viable alternative sources.

Importance of Representational Analysis

Throughout this presentation on the status of Chicanos in higher education reference is made to levels of representation, usually to under-representation or to parity. These levels of representation are based on comparisons between the total general population or the total majority population and the Chicano population. It is our thesis that the enrollment of Chicanos in higher education should be proportionally the same as that of the majority population. This thesis is based on the assumption that abilities are distributed within the Chicano population in the same ratio as they are distributed in the majority population. Therefore, the level of representation of Chicanos in higher education is due to factors other than ability. This type of measure, in common usage today in affirmative action programs, is currently under attack as one which leads to a "quota" mentality and as one antithetical to the basic tenets of higher education. The principal argument against that measure is that

individuals should advance to higher levels of education through demonstrated ability and not as a result of pressures to bring about ethnic, racial, and gender balance. As an ideal there is little reason to resist such a proposition. Nonetheless, it is well-known that advancement in education is dependent on a series of complex factors, not least of which is the ability to pay.

III

The Status of Chicanos in Higher Education

The Response of Higher Education to Chicanos

Higher education was traumatized during the 1960's by student activism. In the late 1950's and early 1960's the United States' universities and colleges had furnished the manpower for the civil rights movement and had been the source of much of the criticism for the injustices throughout U.S. society. In time institutions of higher learning were forced to face the fact that they had violated civil rights to as great, if not greater, an extent as the rest of U.S.'s institutions. As a result of intense pressures these institutions began to react internally to those wrongs they had criticized externally. When institutions began to respond to the pressures by attempting to admit minority students--particularly at the undergraduate level--it became clear that selective recruitment patterns were the determining factor in the admissions process. In order to bring about changes in admissions patterns, "special admissions" programs emerged throughout the country. Students

p. 14 cont'd photo

were admitted using a wider criteria--but only under "special consideration." The traditional norms remained the rule. Those students admitted under "special consideration" had a lower achievement rate as measured by GPA and various test scores than those admitted on a regular basis. They subsequently revealed a higher attrition rate than the "normal" admittees. However these differences were small and remain small, thus raising significant questions that are generally ignored. If people who clearly do not meet normal admissions standards are more apt to succeed than fail, is it possible that "normal" admissions criteria are simply inappropriate for all students?

The argument that students who enter under different criteria do not perform as well as students who enter under traditional criteria has been a significant part of the rationale for not examining the entire question of admissions criteria. Admissions people have reassessed the validity of criteria and method as applied to minorities, but to suggest that the traditional methods are in themselves lacking is something that has precious little support.

By not questioning basic premises and by avoiding close scrutiny of existing practices, institutions of higher learning have been able to maintain the status quo while at the same time projecting the image of being responsive and progressive institutions through the creation of "special" programs and the admission of minority students through "special" criteria. As a consequence, the rate of enrollment of Chicanos into higher education has remained relatively constant rather than increasing since 1970. It is true that there have been gains, but the rate of growth in enrollment is minimal. The result is a minimal increase in the pool of people from whence graduate and professional schools draw. The data shows that the pool of people is not large either in absolute or relative terms.

Graduate institutions thus have been able to stave off demands for increased minority enrollment even more effectively than undergraduate institutions. Yet, when a genuine effort is made, genuine gains are realized. Medical schools are an excellent example. The data shows very clearly that in

1970-71 the number of Chicano or Spanish-surnamed medical students was minimal. Yet between 1970 and 1975 enrollment of Spanish-surnamed students in medical schools increased steadily and meaningfully. If the trend were to continue--a trend now placed in jeopardy as a result of recent judicial action involving the medical school at the University of California, Davis--medical schools in this country would be the first graduate institutions to have reasonably equitable representation of Chicanos. Not far-fetched is to believe that medical schools would reach parity with the proportion of Spanish-surnamed people in the population before any other areas of graduate education. Perhaps medical schools, by virtue of their enrollment policies, are in a stronger position to adjust. The number of slots open for entering medical students has traditionally been far smaller than the number of "qualified" students who apply. When confronted with twice as many "qualified" students as space and finances permit, medical schools have utilized qualitative or "subjective" measures for their admissions decisions. Graduate Schools and other

professional schools have similar practices, but they have not utilized them in the positive manner in which medical schools have. Because graduate and professional schools have not been as responsive as undergraduate institutions in the admission of Chicanos, the percentage of Chicanos that move from the undergraduate ranks into graduate programs is but half that of Whites. As a result the number of Chicanos in graduate schools remains depressingly small with little likelihood of increasing unless substantial reforms significantly alter the existing higher education establishment.

Chicano Representation in Higher Education

This initial discussion offers a précis of the data. There is no intent here to raise particular issues to prominence at the expense of others. The number of issues facing Chicanos in higher education is great and the prominence of an issue may vary from region to region, from university to university, and from year to year. Prominence given to selected issues in the text are directly tied to the data and should be so understood.

The earliest date for which we have

reliable data on Chicanos is 1968. However, that data is sparse and difficult to work with because of the multitude of methods used in its acquisition. Our principal data source is 1970 census materials. An important value of the 1970 data is that the method of acquisition of that data was fairly uniform. Below are some observations taken from the data which is presented in Chapter Four.

Student Population and Enrollment

1. The "drop-out" problem becomes dramatically evident in the 14-15 age group. From ages 14 through 17 Spanish-surnamed enrollment in schools declines at two to three times the rate of the general population.

2. Spanish-surnamed enrollment in all institutions of higher education in the nation was 1.6% in 1968, 2.1% in 1970, and 2.3% in 1972.

3. A greater percentage of the Spanish-surnamed population in the 25 to 34 age bracket remain enrolled in school than do the rest of the population in the same age bracket.

4. Chicano enrollment in higher education is heavily concentrated in two-year institutions.

5. Chicanos are more likely to enroll in public institutions than in private ones.

6. In 1970 only eleven states had over 1% Spanish-surnamed enrollment; in 1972 there were fifteen.

7. In Arizona the Chicano undergraduate enrollment percentage is higher than the Chicano percentage of the general population.

8. For the five Southwestern states, Florida and New York, the 1970 data reveals an average attrition rate for the Spanish-surnamed student population by the fourth year of 80.4% as compared to 62.3% for the majority population.

Undergraduate Enrollment

1. Between 1971 and 1974 there has been a net gain of approximately 27% in Chicano freshmen enrollment in all institutions of higher learning (universities, four-year and two-year colleges).

2. More Chicano freshmen enrolled at public institutions having a high selectivity level than in those with low or medium selectivity in 1973 and 1974. Selectivity level refers to the range of mean test scores on the ACT composite and/or the SAT V & M for entering freshmen. Thus, an institution with a high selectivity level is one whose freshmen class has a high mean score on the above mentioned tests. This mode of measure was devised by the Comparative Institutional Research Program of the American Council on Education and the University of California, Los Angeles. See Chapter Four, Undergraduate Enrollment; Freshmen Data.

3. Chicano enrollment in Catholic institutions of higher learning is predominantly in four-year colleges with a low selectivity level in the 1973 and 1974 academic years.

4. Chicano freshmen enrollment in four-year private, nonsectarian colleges (for 1973 and 1974) is greatest among those with a medium selectivity level.

Graduate Enrollment in Graduate and Professional Schools

1. Chicanos in Graduate Schools more closely approximate parity representation in Education, the Humanities, and the Social Sciences.

2. Spanish-surnamed first-year enrollment in Medical Schools more than tripled between 1970 and 1975.

3. The rate of enrollment of Chicanos in Dental Schools remained constant between 1970 and 1973.

4. The number of Chicanos in Law Schools increased nearly 50% between 1970 and 1974.

The data indicates a number of patterns or trends that demand more attention. First, it is evident from the data that Chicanos are under-represented at all levels of higher education. In terms of both absolute and relative numbers, there are few Chicanos enrolled in higher education. While it is normal to expect fewer numbers at the graduate and professional school level, it does not follow that the proportionate level should also diminish. The proportional representation of Spanish-surnamed people declines the

higher the level of education. This pattern begins with the first year of enrollment in higher education and continues without interruption.

Relatively higher percentages of Chicano enrollment in higher education are found in the five Southwestern states having the highest percentages of Chicanos in the general population (Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas). High percentages of Spanish-surnamed people are found in the educational institutions of two other states, Florida and New York, where the Cuban and Puerto Rican populations respectively are concentrated. The five Southwestern states plus Florida and New York accounted for 83% and 80% of all Spanish-surnamed enrollment in higher education in 1970 and 1972 respectively.

Issues Facing Chicanos in Higher Education

Access. The continuing question of access to institutions of higher learning is the fundamental issue facing Chicanos with respect to higher education. Access at the undergraduate level has once again become a critical issue as a result of the economic

crisis currently being experienced by U.S. institutions of higher education. A leveling-off in the rate of Chicano enrollment in higher education is already evident. Since graduate enrollment is directly dependent on undergraduate enrollment, graduate Chicano enrollment will not only level off very soon but also begin to decline rapidly as funding sources dry up and employment possibilities diminish.

Retention and Attrition. The data points to a diminishing proportion of Chicanos as the level of education rises. The rate of attrition for Chicanos is higher than for any other group. The data does not reveal the reasons for this attrition and while it is safe to assume that attrition is due to a variety of socio-economic factors on the one hand, and to well-known structural limitations of educational institutions on the other, much research is needed in this area. Of interest are new factors which have recently come into play, such as to what extent does entering a two-year institution affect Chicano chances of finishing a four-year program; and what effect does the presence

of other Chicanos, Chicano-related programs, and Chicano-focus courses on campuses have on Chicano enrollment and retention rates.

Completion. The data does not reveal the attrition rate for Chicanos in graduate and professional schools. In view of the very low and very recent enrollment of Chicanos in these institutions it is too early to calculate a legitimate attrition figure. The real issue, moreover, is completion of the necessary requisites for a graduate degree. There is reason to be concerned about the low completion rate with respect to the doctorate. Many Chicanos have managed to complete all the requirements except the dissertation. It would be very useful to know how the completion rate of Chicanos compares with that of the majority population, which according to one recent study is only about 40% of those entering doctoral programs.

Faculty. The number of Chicanos occupying faculty positions in U.S. colleges and universities remains very small despite the increases of the last five years. Although there are no exact figures available the total number of Chicano faculty does not

exceed 750. Most of those are not on tenure tracks and many do not hold the doctorate. Clearly one of the critical issues facing Chicanos is the need to increase the number of doctorate-holding, tenure-track Chicano faculty.

Administration. The number of Chicanos holding administrative posts in higher education is even smaller than those holding academic positions. Since most Chicano administrators in higher education occupy low-level positions in minority-oriented programs, Chicanos in first or second level administrative positions are even more rare a species. At this date there is one Chicano president of a four-year institution; less than 10 Chicano presidents of two-year institutions; one academic vice-chancellor of a graduate institution; one vice-president for student affairs; two deans of four-year institutions; and less than 10 associate deans. Because institutional policy and activity is increasingly a function of institutional administrative structure rather than academic structure the need for Chicanos in academic administrative posts becomes even more acute.

Funding. Perhaps the critical factor in whether Chicanos will be successful or not in achieving adequate and equitable representation in higher education is funding. Nearly all endeavors in higher education are costly. It is clear from recent experience that the tolerance of institutions and society in general towards Chicanos is directly dependent on financial resources. To a considerable extent the resistance Chicanos and Chicano endeavors are experiencing in academia is the result of the fiscal squeeze that institutions of higher education have been feeling in the past few years. The following areas of concern directly affect Chicanos in higher education.

1. Financial assistance for students at the undergraduate level continues to be a must. A Chicano undergraduate at the University of California, to give but one example, requires nearly twice as much financial aid as does the average student. Although Chicanos constitute but a tiny percentage of the overall enrollment at the University of California, Chicanos constitute 39% of all

students whose family income is less than $6,000 per annum. Yet Chicanos receive fewer grants and scholarships than student aid recipients as a whole and have twice the dependency on loans. While particulars of financial aid may vary from institution to institution, one thing does not--the overwhelming proportion of Chicano students who require aid. Increasing Chicano enrollment most definitely means increasing the amount of funds available for student assistance.

2. The need for financial assistance for Chicanos is equally as great at the graduate level. At Stanford University, in a survey conducted recently, it was discovered that 88% of the Chicano graduate students who responded to the survey were from families whose income was less than $10,000. By the time Chicanos reach graduate school their level of indebtedness is very high, which makes continuing in school even more difficult.

3. Direct student support is only one area in which financial considerations

are primary. Counseling services, academic support programs, and instructional programs centered on Chicano needs also require continued funding. All too often such programs are on a special funding basis rather than constituting part of the regular institutional budget. In times of budget cutbacks and general retrenchment in the area of minority programs, this marginal importance reflected in budgetary allocations frequently results in the undermining or even elimination of these programs.

4. Funds are needed for research. This is a critical issue for both graduate students and faculty. For many graduate students the ability to complete the dissertation is often solely dependent on the availability of resources for researching and writing the dissertation. Clearly the availability of resources for research can have a dramatic effect on the time required for completion and on the nature and quality of the dissertation. Faculty need resources to increase their release time, to assist

them in the research process, and to facilitate the preparation of manuscripts for publication. Moreover, there is a close relationship between the amount of funds available to finance research and the quality of research which is produced.

5. With respect to Chicano publications, money is also an urgent need. Chicanos have quickly discovered that chances for publication of Chicano related research is tied closely to the whims of publishers, whether the materials are saleable, or what is in vogue at the moment. Chicano administered publications that have a Chicano focus are the most desirable and realistic alternatives to facilitate and increase publications by Chicanos. The continued existence and success of Chicano publications requires ever-increasing financial resources.

Instruction and Curriculum. Of prime importance is the issue of the nature and quality of the Chicano experience in higher education. What is the quality of instruction and course matter for Chicanos? To what extent are

Chicano subjects and concerns integrated into the curriculum? How much curricular alternative is there for Chicano students at all levels? To what extent do Chicano Studies courses fulfill institutional requirements? What validity do they carry in academic councils at both the undergraduate and graduate levels?

Chicano Studies. Chicano Studies programs, centers, and departments have played a major role in the struggle to improve the status of Chicanos in higher education. It is critical that Chicano Studies units be maintained in institutions where they exist and established in those where they do not. The potential for continuing pressure on institutions to increase the numbers of Chicano students, faculty, and staff is frequently tied to the vitality of Chicano Studies. Improvements in the nature and quality of the Chicano educational experience are strongly influenced by the existence of Chicano Studies. The stimulus for research into the Chicano experience is principally provided by Chicano Studies. The threat posed to the survival of Chicano Studies by the fiscal crisis is serious and

is a key issue for Chicanos.

Research. The quality of research on Chicanos is also a very critical issue. Chicano scholars are familiar with the poor quality of the work done in the past and acutely aware of the need to produce better studies. Much of the existing literature is steeped in stereotype, but "respectable" because it is written in "respectable" form and published in "respectable" journals. Anyone who attempts to inform him or herself about Chicanos is at best going to be faced with well meaning but gross misinterpretations of the Chicano experience. Such misinterpretations continue into the present and can only be combatted by stereotype-free studies which are based on new information along with criticism of previous research leading to the development of a new interpretative paradigm.

The Key Issue - Survival. As previously mentioned, it has not been possible to address all the issues that confront Chicanos in this report. Chicanos are faced with all the problems which face higher education in the United States today and more. The information available is extremely limited; the data available

is exceedingly difficult to obtain. The issues that have been enumerated should be obvious to all and most can name others. In the last analysis, however, for Chicanos the fundamental issue is one--survival.

IV

A Profile of Chicano Participation in Higher Education

The Eligible Population

Table 1 shows in numbers the race and ethnic distribution of the population by age groups and Table 2 shows the same data in percentages. The number of Spanish-surnamed between the ages of 18 and 24 and the percentage of the Spanish-surnamed population which that number constitutes is shown in Table 3. These figures are useful as a guide to the relative representation of enrollment in institutions of higher education. In this report the basis for comparison is the percentage distribution in the total population. The rationale for using this basis for comparison is that this is the most common mode in use. If one uses the "college age" (18 to 24 years old) bracket for comparison, the disparities between the enrollment percentages and the proportion in the population would be even greater since the Spanish-surnamed population is 5% of the 18 to 24 years old bracket and only 4.6% of the total population.

Utilization of the more conservative interpretation of relative representation, however, allows more confidence in whatever differences appear and in inferences drawn from comparisons (See Tables 1, 2 and 3).

The use of the conservative interpretation of relative representation is important. First, it gives institutions the benefit of the doubt. Second, it tends to dilute the possibility of someone shifting to an argument about "quotas" to avoid confronting the fundamental issue of low Chicano enrollment. Third, it keeps the discussion on a manageable level by not introducing another parameter. Finally, it allows a far greater tolerance in the accuracy of the data since Chicanos in the "college age" group are a greater percentage of that category than total Chicanos are a proportion of the total population.

There is an additional cushion or margin of tolerance integrated into the data presentation. Comparative enrollment data is shown for years [illegible] 1970 but population data is not. The 1972 Current Population Survey (CPS)

Table 1

Race And Ethnic Distribution Of The United States Population By Age Group, 1970

Ethnic Group	All Ages	15-19	18-19	20-24	25-29
Blacks	22,539,362	2,427,628	883,048	1,755,024	1,410,667
American Indian	760,572	82,940	30,759	65,147	51,789
Oriental	1,526,461	136,252	48,794	121,149	122,329
Spanish-surnamed	9,294,509	977,353	346,891	773,012	696,147
White	178,119,221	16,522,603	5,892,437	13,072,315	11,778,284
Total	203,210,158	19,193,879	7,201,929	15,786,697	13,393,662

Source: Urban Education Inc., Minority Enrollment and Representation in Institutions of Higher Education; A Survey of Minority Student Enrollment in Colleges, Universities, Graduate Schools and Professional Schools in 50 States and the District of Columbia, (Commissioned by the Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y., 1973) Census data, pg. 1.

Note: The data for the tables in the Urban Education Inc. study was taken from several sources. These include, U.S. Bureau of Census Data, Census of Population, 1970; Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1970, (HEW, Office for Civil Rights, OCR-72-8); Institutions of Higher Education, 1970, Constituent Institutions of 1970, (HEW, Report BI Final, Unpublished); Graduate School Programs for Minority/Disadvantaged Students, (Report of an Initial Survey, Bruce Hamilton, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 1973); Dube, W. F., "U.S. Medical School enrollments 1968-69 through 1972-73." Journal of Medical Education (Vol. 48, March 1973); "Minority Student Enrollment and Opportunities in U.S.," Dental Schools Annual Report, Dental Education Supplement 1972/73, (Division of Educational Measurements, American Dental Association).

The citation for those tables in this report that are taken from the Urban Education Inc. study will be abbreviated for convenience but will indicate the original source, e.g., Urban Education Inc., Census data; Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data. In each instance the page numbers cited refer to the Ford Foundation commissioned study by Urban Education Inc. The data is for the forty-eight coterminous states and the District of Columbia.

Table 2

Race And Ethnic Distribution Of The United States Population By Age Group, 1970 By Percent

Ethnic Group	All Ages	15-19	18-19	20-24	25-29
Black	11.1%	12.7	12.3	11.1	10.5
American Indian	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Oriental	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.9
Spanish-surnamed	4.6	5.1	4.8	4.9	5.2
White	87.7	86.0	81.8	83.0	87.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Urban Education Inc., Census data, pg. 1.

Table 3

18-24 Year Olds As A Percentage Of The Total Race And Ethnic Populations, 1970

Ethnic Group	Number	Percent of Population
Total U.S.	22,988,576	11.3
White	18,964,752	10.6
Black	2,638,072	11.7
American Indian	95,906	12.6
Spanish-surnamed	1,119,903	12.0
Orientals	169,943	11.1

Source: Urban Education Inc., Census data, pg. 4.

conducted by the Bureau of the Census did not reflect new information about geographic distribution from the 1970 Census and did not include new categories used in the 1973 CPS that appear to have caused an increase in the total Spanish origin category of the Census. As a consequence the 1973 CPS is more in line with the 1970 census estimate. That data shows an increase of approximately 17% of the total Spanish origin population which translates into an increase of approximately 0.6% in the percentage of total population by 1973 (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1973, Series P-20, No. 264, May 1974). Therefore it can be reasonably concluded that the magnitude of the difference between enrollment and population proportions utilized in this presentation is less than the actual disparity. This, of course, provides even stronger reinforcement for the validity of the patterns and trends that are reflected in the data.

Table 4 shows the percentage of individuals enrolled in school by age groups. It is apparent that at least one reason there

are so few Chicanos in higher education is low secondary school enrollment. These figures make clear the secondary dropout problem is persisting among Chicanos. The attrition rate begins to show dramatically in the 14-15 years old age group. While the rest of the population loses between four and five percent from the level of enrollment in the 7-13 years old age bracket, the Spanish-surnamed population is losing eleven percent (11%) or over two times as great a proportion. From the 14-15 years old to the 16-17 years old group the Spanish-surnamed group drops out at twice the rate of the rest of the population (19.5% vs. 9.8% and 9.9%). The 18-19 years old age group drops are relatively closer among the populations compared but by this time the attrition rate among Chicanos has already taken its toll. The transition period from 18-19 years old to 20-21 years old is difficult to assess. If a person survives in school until he or she is 17 years old, however, the comparison indicates that among the Spanish-surnamed population the likelihood of the individual remaining enrolled in school until age 21 is between two and two and a half times as great as his

Black or White counterpart. The tragedy, of course, is that by this time the ranks of the Spanish-surnamed in schools have been so thoroughly decimated that it could hardly be any other way. The data also shows that in the 22-24 years old group the percentage of Chicanos who remain enrolled in school do so at nearly double the rate of Blacks and at approximately 88% the rate of Whites. A greater percentage of Spanish-surnamed in the 25-34 age bracket remains enrolled in school than do Blacks or Whites of that age group. Chicanos who survive high school tend to continue schooling at a higher rate than either Blacks or Whites (See Table 4).

Unfortunately this information was not compiled prior to the 1970 Census. The stereotype that Chicanos place schooling very low on their list of priorities might have been more adequately challenged. While it is dangerous to generalize too much from this data, it is difficult to avoid the temptation. One thing can be inferred from the data. At the time of the 1970 Census, there still existed a substantial incompatibility between schools and Chicanos in the 14-17

Table 4

Percentage Of Individuals Enrolled In School
By Age Group And Race, 1970

Age Group	Total	Whites	Blacks	Spanish-surnamed
7-13	96.0	96.3	94.9	95.6
14-15	91.8	92.1	90.2	84.6
16-17	81.8	82.3	80.3	65.1
18-19	45.5	45.6	44.3	31.5
20-21	16.3	17.1	12.5	18.8
22-24	8.0	8.6	4.1	7.6
25-34	4.4	4.5	3.6	5.3

Source: Urban Education Inc., Census Data, pg. 6.

years old age group. Also, in spite of many changes that have occurred in recent years (e.g., the acceptance of Mexican American or Chicano Studies into the curriculum in many schools), patterns of enrollment very likely remain substantially the same.

Undergraduate Enrollment

Distribution by Type of Institution. The tremendous attrition of Chicanos during the

secondary school years portends what occurs in enrollment in higher education. Spanish-surnamed enrollment in 1970 in all institutions of higher education in the nation is 2.1% of the total enrollment (See Table 5). It should be noted that the Total Minority category in this and subsequent tables includes the Spanish-surnamed population. The enrollment figures show clearly that Chicano enrollment in higher education is concentrated heavily in two-year institutions or community colleges. There are nearly two times as many Chicanos in two-year colleges as there are in universities and nearly one and a half times as many as in four-year colleges. By contrast there are over one and a half times as many Whites in universities as there are in two-year colleges and nearly two times as many Whites in four-year colleges as in two-year institutions. The Total Minority population, while not as heavily concentrated in universities as are Whites, still fares better than Chicanos. For the Total Minority category there are nearly one and a half times as many people in two-year colleges as in universities (compared to two times as many for Chicanos).

Table 5

U.S. Undergraduate Enrollment, Full-Time:
All Institutions And Publicly And Privately
Controlled Colleges And Universities, 1970

	Universities	Four-Year Colleges	All Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	All Institutions
Publicly And Privately Controlled Institutions					
Spanish-surnamed (4.6%)*	24,066 1.4**	32,424 1.5	56,490 1.5	46,298 4.0	102,788 2.1
Total Minority (16.8%)	116,375 6.8	242,784 11.6	359,159 9.4	167,067 14.5	526,226 10.6
Whites (83.2%)	1,604,430 93.2	1,850,767 88.4	3,455,197 90.6	984,345 85.5	4,439,542 89.4
Total	1,720,805 100.0	2,093,551 100.0	3,814,356 100.0	1,151,412 100.0	4,965,768 100.0
Publicly Controlled Institutions					
Spanish-surnamed (4.6%)	20,390 1.4	24,705 1.9	45,095 1.7	45,175 4.3	90,270 2.4
Total Minority (16.8%)	91,458 6.4	166,364 13.1	257,822 9.6	157,819 14.9	415,641 11.1
Whites (83.2%)	1,326,268 93.5	1,103,670 86.9	2,429,938 90.4	899,675 85.1	3,329,613 88.9
Total	1,417,726 100.0	1,270,034 100.0	2,687,760 100.0	1,057,492 100.0	3,745,252 100.0
Privately Controlled Institutions					
Spanish-surnamed (4.6%)	3,676 1.2	7,719 0.9	11,395 1.0	1,123 1.2	12,518 1.0
Total Minority (16.8%)	24,917 8.2	76,420 9.3	101,337 9.0	9,250 9.8	110,587 9.1
Whites (83.2%)	278,162 91.8	747,097 90.7	1,025,259 91.0	84,670 90.2	1,109,929 90.9
Total	303,079 100.0	823,517 100.0	1,126,596 100.0	93,920 100.0	1,220,516 100.0

Source: Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights and Census data, pp.17-19.

*Percentage distribution in the national population.

**Percent distribution in each category.

Thus, while there remains a substantial discrepancy for the Total Minority population between enrollment levels at the universities and two-year colleges, the discrepancy for the Spanish-surnamed population is substantially greater. In the instance of four-year colleges, approximately one and a half times more total minority individuals are enrolled than in two-year colleges. The reverse of this is true for Chicanos (See Table 5).

If these enrollment figures are converted to percentages by group, they allow for the development of several arguments that can be reached inductively (See Table 6). The first is that Chicanos enroll in two-year colleges at a substantially greater rate than do either the Total Minority or the White population. The Total Minority population is also enrolled in two-year institutions at a greater rate than are Whites. The White population enrolls in universities and four-year colleges at a greater rate than in two-year institutions. The White population not only dominates universities in numbers but individuals from that group are more likely to be enrolled in a university than in a two-year college. More

Chicanos are enrolled in all four-year institutions than in two-year colleges but only by a small margin. In contarst twice as many individuals in the Total Minority catagory are enrolled in all four-year institutions as in two-year colleges and three and a half times as many Whites are enrolled in all four-year institutions as in two-year colleges. Chicanos who enroll in institutions of higher education are least likely to enroll in universities. Whites, on the other hand, are most likely to enroll in four-year colleges and substantially more likely to go to a university than to two-year colleges (See Table 6).

Public institutions are more likely to enroll Chicanos than are private ones. While this is true for all groups, the relative rate of enrollment of Chicanos in private institutions is approximately half that of Whites and the Total Minority population (2.0 and 1.7 respectively). Chicanos, therefore, are most likely to be enrolled in public two-year colleges. From an institutional perspective, Chicanos are most under-represented in private four-year colleges (See Table 5).

Table 6

Spanish-surnamed Enrollment In All Public And Private Institutions Of Higher Education, 1970
Percentage Distribution

	Universities	Four-Year Colleges	All Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	All Institutions
Publicly And Privately Controlled Institutions					
Spanish-surnamed	23.4	31.5	55.0	45.0	100.0
Total Minority	22.1	46.1	68.3	31.7	100.0
Whites	36.1	41.7	77.8	22.2	100.0
Total	34.7	42.2	76.8	23.2	100.0
Publicly Controlled Institutions*					
Spanish-surnamed	19.8	24.0	43.9	43.9	87.8
Total Minority	17.4	31.6	49.0	30.0	79.0
Whites	29.9	24.9	54.7	20.3	75.0
Total	28.5	25.6	54.1	21.3	75.4
Privately Controlled Institutions**					
Spanish-surnamed	3.6	7.5	11.1	1.1	12.2
Total Minority	4.7	14.5	19.3	1.8	21.0
Whites	6.3	16.8	23.1	1.9	25.0
Total	6.1	16.6	22.7	1.9	24.6

Source: Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pp. 108-110.

*Percentages will not total 100 because this involves public colleges only.

**Percentages will not total 100 because this involves private colleges only.

Historical Comparison. The data available allows for some comparison of enrollment figures over a period of years. The Office of Civil Rights has computerized a Universe File of Institutions of Higher Education who have responded to their 1968, 1970, and 1972 surveys making it possible to produce comparative data (See Table 7). A difficulty with the comparative data is that only those institutions that responded to all three surveys are included. The figures for 1970 therefore, are different in the comparative data than the data for the same year that is presented in other instances in this report. The relative percentages for the historical data, however, are very close to that presented in other instances. In the previous section (See Tables 5 and 6) data is presented for undergraduate enrollment for public and private institutions. The data for publicly and privately controlled institutions was not compiled in the same manner for the three surveys used in the historical comparison. Thus, the figures shown in Table 8 include both graduate and undergraduate enrollment.

The data shows that there has been an

Table 7

Historical Comparison

U.S. Undergraduate Enrollment, Full-Time, 1968, 1970, 1972
All Institutions

Year	1968		1970		1972	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Spanish-surnamed	49,205	1.7	98,453	2.0	130,840	2.4
Total Minority	294,316	10.0	504,118	10.4	685,385	12.4
Whites	2,642,850	90.0	4,346,285	89.6	4,857,819	87.6
Total	2,937,166	100.0	4,850,403	100.0	5,543,204	100.0

Source: Office for Civil Rights Reports.

Table 8

Historical Comparison

U.S. Graduate And Undergraduate Enrollment Full-Time,
1968, 1970, 1972 - All Institutions

Year	1968 Number	%	1970 Number	%	1972 Number	%
Publicly Controlled Institutions						
Spanish-surnamed	38,125	2.1	88,803	2.3	117,985	2.6
Total Minority	204,226	11.0	413,569	10.5	571,045	12.5
Whites	1,651,455	89.0	3,518,876	89.5	3,990,146	87.5
Total	1,855,681	100.0	3,932,445	100.0	4,561,191	100.0
Privately Controlled Institutions						
Spanish-surnamed	12,314	1.0	15,330	1.1	21,331	1.4
Total Minority	98,038	8.0	126,701	9.0	165,611	10.6
Whites	1,132,778	92.0	1,283,281	91.0	1,401,944	89.4
Total	1,230,816	100.0	1,409,982	100.0	1,567,555	100.0

increase in Chicano enrollment between 1968 and 1972 but it also shows that the relative increase has been minimal. The greatest growth has occurred in publicly controlled institutions with thrice as many Chicanos in 1972 as in 1968. But the real issue is still in the relative rates of growth of enrollment. There is no question that there are more Chicanos enrolled today than there were in previous years. There is no question that there is a slight increase in that number each year. But the level of representation of Chicanos in institutions of higher education has remained nearly constant. If, for example, we look at the growth of the White population and compare that with the growth of Chicano enrollment we find that Chicano increase is only 3.6% of the White increase. While this is certainly a gain it is clearly not one of a magnitude that will significantly alter the percentage of the whole that Chicano enrollment constitutes in the near future. There is a simple set of conclusions that can be drawn. For every Chicano enrolled there are twenty-eight (28) White students. So long as that is the case it is

ludicrous to argue that Chicanos are taking away slots from Whites. There are more Chicanos in higher education now than before but there are also more Whites in higher education than before. The rate of growth is higher for Chicanos than for Whites but the relative presence of Chicanos has not significantly altered nor is there evidence that it soon will.

Freshmen Data. Data available for freshmen from American Council on Education Research Reports is expressed as weighted national norms and is valuable in showing trends or patterns for Chicanos as well as other groups. Table 9 presents freshmen data for Mexican American/Chicano and Puerto Rican American populations.

This data shows the same patterns and trends as the data previously presented. Additionally, the data shows very little change occurring from year to year. For Chicanos there has been a slight increase (from 1971 to 1972) in first year university students and a more evident change in four-year colleges (over two times as many freshmen in four years). The pattern in two-year

Table 9

Weighted National Norms For Chicano And Puerto Rican American Freshmen 1971-74

Year	Ethnic Group	Universities	Four-Year Colleges	Two-Year Colleges	All Institutions
1971	Chicano	0.4	0.3	2.0	1.1
	Puerto Rican	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2
1972	Chicano	0.5	0.4	3.3	1.5
	Puerto Rican	0.2	0.9	0.5	0.6
1973	Chicano	0.5	0.5	2.4	1.3
	Puerto Rican	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.4
1974	Chicano	0.5	0.7	2.8	1.5
	Puerto Rican	0.2	0.8	0.8	0.6

Source: American Council on Education, The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1971-74 (ACE Research Reports, Washington, D.C. and Los Angeles).

Note: This data is taken from four reports, one for each year (1971-74). For the first two years the reports were published in Washington, D.C. Reports are now developed at UCLA. The norms are computed from survey data which is provided by the students. In this instance students chose between identifying themselves as Mexican American/Chicanos, Puerto Rican American, or other. Institutions included in the sample are not all the same ones for each year (although most are), and the number of institutions in the sample vary slightly from year to year.

colleges, while not as smooth, shows a net gain in freshmen enrollment. Because of the gains in four- and two-year colleges, there has been a net increase of approximately 27% for all institutions. When the data for both Chicano and Puerto Rican Americans is aggregated, the patterns remain. The aggregate data shows a small increase in university freshmen, more than doubling of four-year college freshmen, half again as many freshmen in two-year colleges, and a gain of approximately 39% in the freshmen class between 1971 and 1974 for all institutions.

There is an inference of differences of quality between the types of institutions mentioned. The common assumption is that the order of quality begins with universities and decreases to two-year colleges. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program of the American Council of Education and the University of California, Los Angeles have devised a measure of the selectivity of institutions that participate in their annual survey. This data can provide insight into the selectivity of institutions (and by inference, quality) in which Chicanos enroll.

See Table 10 for the measures utilized in determining selectivity level.

Table 10

Range Of Mean Test Scores
For Entering Students By Selectivity
Of Institutions Of Higher Education

Selectivity Level	Approximate Range of Mean Test Scores	
	ACT Composite	SAT V & M
Low	22 or less	999 or less
Medium	23 - 25	1,000 - 1,149
High	25 - 28	1,150 - 1,249
Very High	28 - greater	1,250 or greater

Source: Astin, Alexander W., et al., The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1973, (Comparative Institutional Research Program, American Council on Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973) pp. 12-14.

Tables 11 and 12 show Chicano and Puerto Rican American Freshmen enrollment in institutions by selectivity level. This data provides a valuable insight into Spanish-surnamed enrollment distribution. By making some

assumptions, some expectations can be extrapolated. First, the assumption is that the rate of attrition among colleges with different levels of selectivity increases slightly with the level of selectivity. Second, given survival in an institution, those who graduate from institutions with higher levels of selectivity will have a greater probability of continuing into graduate status (See Tables 11 and 12).

Persuing Table 11 it is evident that the aggregate Spanish-surnamed Freshmen population has enrollment patterns. In public universities for both years for both men and women, the percentage of Spanish-surnamed enrolled is greatest in institutions with the highest selectivity levels. This is especially true for the Chicano freshmen who have a far greater proportion of the Freshmen class in public institutions with high selectivity than in those institutions with medium or low selectivity.

In private universities there is a good deal more inconsistency for both men and women. The one salient feature is that in

Table 11

Selectivity Levels Of Public And Private Universities
Chicanos And Puerto Rican American Enrollment By Sex

	Men						Women					
	Public Universities			Private Universities			Public Universities			Private Universities		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
1973												
Chicanos	0.3	0.3	0.9	0.2	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.2	1.0	0.3	0.6	0.8
	(.4)	(.5)	(1.1)	(1.0)	(1.1)	(1.3)	(.6)	(.3)	(1.4)	(1.0)	(.8)	(1.3)
Puerto Rican Americans	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.7	0.2	0.5
1974												
Chicanos	0.2	0.2	1.4	0.3	2.7	0.9	0.2	0.1	1.2	0.3	1.8	0.5
	(.3)	(.4)	(1.6)	(1.1)	(3.3)	(1.4)	(.3)	(.2)	(1.4)	(1.2)	(2.2)	(.8)
Puerto Rican Americans	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.4	0.3

Source: Astin, Alexander, W., et al., The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall, 1973-74. Cooperative Institutional Research Program, American Council on Education, University of California, Los Angeles.

Table 12

Selectivity Levels Of Public And Private Four-Year Colleges
Chicanos And Puerto Rican American Enrollment By Type of College

	4-Year Public Colleges			4-Year Private Non-Sectarian Colleges				4-Year Other Sectarian Colleges			4-Year Catholic Colleges		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Very High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
1973													
Chicanos	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.1	1.5	0.6	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.8	3.2	0.6	0.3
	(.9)	(.4)	(1.5)	(.5)	(1.7)	(1.1)	(1.2)	(.5)	(.4)	(1.0)	(3.8)	(.9)	(.8)
Puerto Rican Americans	0.2	0.2	1.2	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.5
1974													
Chicanos	0.5	0.2	0.6	0.3	2.5	1.0	0.9	0.2	0.3	0.4	5.7	0.4	0.2
	(.7)	(.3)	(4.0)	(.6)	(2.7)	(1.5)	(1.4)	(.4)	(.5)	(.6)	(6.3)	(.8)	(.8)
Puerto Rican Americans	0.2	0.1	3.4	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.6

Source: Astin, Alexander, W., et al., The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall, 1973-74. Cooperative Institutional Research Program, American Council on Education, University of California, Los Angeles.

1974, private universities with medium selectivity level took a much higher percentage of Chicano freshmen (male and female) than in the previous year and than public universities had for either year. The rate of enrollment tended to increase or remain relatively constant for most institutions between 1973 and 1974 with the exceptions of public universities with low selectivity (esp. for women) and private universities with high selectivity particularly for women.

The most dramatic figures for four-year colleges are for the Catholic institutions. For both years Chicanos are most represented by a considerable rate at those four-year Catholic colleges with low selectivity level. In the four-year private non-sectarian colleges with a medium level of selectivity the highest rate of enrollment and an increase from 1973 to 1974 is evident. This category viz., the four-year private non-sectarian colleges, has the least Chicano and aggregate Spanish-surnamed representation in those colleges with a low selectivity level. Puerto Rican Americans have their highest representation by a significant margin in public

four-year colleges with a marked increase from 1973 to 1974.

These two tables (Table 11 and Table 12) allow for some fairly conclusive generalities. Chicanos and Puerto Rican Americans and the combination of the two tend to constitute a higher percentage of the freshmen class in institutions with higher levels of selectivity. The very notable exceptions are four-year Catholic colleges with low selectivity and private universities with a medium level of selectivity for Chicanos and for Puerto Rican-Americans as well as four-year public colleges with a high level of selectivity. Four-year private non-sectarian colleges with high and very high selectivity levels have Chicano and Puerto Rican American representation that is well within the median range for institutions of all types described above.

Geographic Distribution. Table 13 shows the 1970 undergraduate enrollment for Spanish-surnamed and others in percentages and numbers by state. Interesting to note, all of the states have a measurable percentage of

Spanish-surnamed enrolled although only eleven states have 1.0% or above (See Table 14). As might be antitipated the highest percentage of undergraduate enrollment occurs in the five Southwestern states (New Mexico, Texas, Arizona, California and Colorado in that order) (See Tables 13 and 14).

However, comparing enrollment to population, the rank order of these states alters. Arizona, where the undergraduate enrollment percentage is slightly higher than the percentage in that state's population, is first. Next come New Mexico, Texas, Colorado and finally California, all of which have rates ranging from enrollment figures being 40% of the population percentages to 48%. Thus, with the exception of Arizona, by 1970 none of the other states in the Southwest had reached an enrollment level or percentage that was half of the percentage of the Spanish-surnamed population in the state. Florida, where there is a large Cuban population, has reached an enrollment level just over half (53%) that is in the state's population. In New York, where the Spanish-surnamed population is comprised primarily of Puerto

Table 13

Undergraduate Enrollment, Full-Time In Institutions Of Higher Education

State Summaries, 1970

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Alabama	292	.4	.3	15,572	19.5	19.7	64,334	80.5	73.3	79,906	100.0
Arizona	4,052	7.1	6.3	7,225	12.7	15.1	49,672	87.3	84.9	56,897	100.0
Arkansas	220	.6	.2	6,529	16.4	18.7	33,281	83.6	81.3	39,810	100.0
California	35,065	6.2	15.5	99,048	17.6	25.6	463,162	82.4	74.4	562,210	100.0
Colorado	4,278	5.3	13.0	7,840	9.6	16.9	73,508	90.4	83.1	81,348	100.0
Connecticut	495	.9	.2	2,708	4.8	6.6	53,558	95.2	93.4	56,266	100.0
Delaware	31	.2	1.1	1,545	10.7	15.8	12,898	89.3	84.2	14,443	100.0
D.C.	216	.8	2.1	9,668	34.5	73.9	18,335	65.5	26.1	28,003	100.0
Florida	4,820	3.5	6.6	18,410	13.4	22.2	118,796	86.6	77.8	137,206	100.0
Georgia	248	.3	.6	14,076	17.7	26.7	65,620	82.3	85.2	79,696	100.0
Idaho	87	.3	2.4	481	1.8	4.0	25,956	98.2	96.0	26,437	100.0
Illinois	2,069	.8	3.3	26,697	10.9	16.6	219,173	89.1	83.4	245,870	100.0
Indiana	540	.4	2.3	5,321	4.2	9.3	121,789	95.8	90.7	127,110	100.0
Iowa	196	.2	.6	1,866	2.3	2.0	79,136	97.7	98.0	81,002	100.0
Kansas	584	.8	2.1	3,708	4.8	7.5	73,876	95.2	92.5	77,584	100.0
Kentucky	87	.1	.4	3,596	5.2	7.8	66,080	94.8	92.2	69,676	100.0
Louisiana	835	1.0	1.9	19,586	22.8	31.9	66,226	77.2	68.1	85,812	100.0
Maine	36	.2	.4	327	1.4	1.0	22,637	98.6	99.0	22,964	100.0
Maryland	509	.7	1.4	10,396	14.2	19.7	62,765	85.8	80.3	73,161	100.0
Mass.	993	.6	1.1	7,531	4.5	4.6	158,819	95.5	95.4	166,350	100.0
Michigan	1,308	.6	1.5	18,558	7.9	13.1	217,799	92.1	86.9	236,357	100.0

Table 13

Undergraduate Enrollment (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Minnesota	535	.5	.6	3,232	3.0	2.3	106,036	97.0	97.7	109,268	100.0
Mississippi	63	.1	.4	15,574	29.3	37.6	37,637	70.7	62.4	53,211	100.0
Missouri	950	.8	.9	8,107	7.1	11.5	105,519	92.9	88.5	113,626	100.0
Montana	51	.6	1.1	381	4.2	5.4	8,603	95.8	94.6	8,984	100.0
Nebraska	253	.5	1.4	1,116	2.4	4.7	45,230	96.7	95.3	46,346	100.0
Nevada	95	1.0	5.6	455	4.6	13.5	9,402	95.4	86.5	9,857	100.0
N. Hampshire	96	.4	.4	577	2.4	.9	23,613	97.6	99.1	24,190	100.0
New Jersey	1,037	1.3	1.9	9,477	9.5	13.0	90,542	90.5	87.0	100,019	100.0
New Mexico	5,564	19.1	40.1	6,949	23.9	49.4	22,168	76.1	50.6	29,117	100.0
New York	9,231	2.2	4.9	39,726	9.4	17.6	348,055	90.6	82.4	423,781	100.0
N. Carolina	218	.2	.4	21,826	17.3	23.6	104,418	82.7	76.4	126,244	100.0
N. Dakota	20	.1	.3	406	1.6	3.1	24,945	98.4	96.9	25,351	100.0
Ohio	622	.3	1.3	14,366	5.8	11.4	231,767	94.8	89.4	246,133	100.0
Oklahoma	432	.5	1.4	8,367	10.6	12.0	70,869	89.4	88.0	79,236	100.0
Oregon	526	.7	1.7	3,955	5.3	4.2	70,860	94.7	95.8	74,815	100.0
Pennsylvania	910	.4	.4	14,672	5.8	9.3	238,851	94.2	90.7	253,523	100.0
Rhode Island	98	.4	.7	1,081	4.1	4.4	25,155	95.9	95.6	26,236	100.0
S. Carolina	401	.8	.4	8,923	17.7	31.9	41,462	82.3	68.9	50,385	100.0
S. Dakota	20	.1	.4	450	2.0	5.6	22,143	98.0	94.4	22,593	100.0
Tennessee	114	.1	.4	12,335	13.1	16.4	81,505	86.9	83.6	93,840	100.0
Texas	22,054	7.8	18.4	47,631	16.8	31.2	736,558	83.2	68.8	284,189	100.0
Utah	544	.9	4.1	1,849	3.2	6.3	55,483	96.8	93.7	57,332	100.0

Table 13

Undergraduate Enrollment (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Vermont	87	.5	.6	370	2.2	1.0	16,630	97.8	99.0	17,000	100.0
Virginia	151	.2	1.0	12,708	13.3	20.0	82,697	86.7	80.0	95,405	100.0
Washington	985	.9	2.1	6,459	6.0	6.4	101,259	94.0	93.4	107,718	100.0
West Virginia	73	.2	.4	1,741	5.0	4.5	33,415	95.0	94.5	35,136	100.0
Wisconsin	454	.3	.9	4,433	3.2	4.4	132,993	96.8	95.6	137,426	100.0
Wyoming	46	2.5	5.6	113	6.2	8.2	1,722	93.8	91.8	1,835	100.0

Source: Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pg. 96.

Table 14

Rank Order By Percentages Of Spanish-surnamed Undergraduate Enrollment By State, 1970

Rank	State	% in Population	Enrollment	
			%	Number
1	New Mexico	40.1	19.1	5,564
2	Texas	18.4	7.8	22,054
3	Arizona	6.3	7.1	4,052
4	California	15.5	6.2	35,065
5	Colorado	13.0	5.3	4,278
6	Florida	6.6	3.5	4,820
7	Wyoming	5.6	2.5	46
8	New York	4.9	2.2	9,231
9	New Jersey	1.9	1.3	1,307
10	Louisiana	1.9	1.0	835
10	Nevada	5.6	1.0	95
11	Connecticut	.2	.9	495
11	Utah	4.1	.9	544
11	Washington	2.1	.9	985
12	D.C.	2.1	.8	216
12	Illinois	3.3	.8	2,069
12	Kansas	2.1	.8	584
12	S. Carolina	.4	.8	401
13	Maryland	1.4	.7	509
14	Arkansas	.2	.6	220
14	Michigan	1.5	.6	1,308
14	Montana	1.1	.6	51
15	Minnesota	.6	.5	535
15	Oklahoma	1.4	.5	432
15	Vermont	.6	.5	87
16	Alabama	.3	.4	292
16	Indiana	2.3	.4	540
16	New Hampshire	.4	.4	96
16	Pennsylvania	.4	.4	910
17	Georgia	.6	.3	248
17	Idaho	2.4	.3	87
17	Ohio	1.3	.3	622
17	Wisconsin	.9	.3	454
18	Delaware	1.1	.2	31
18	Iowa	.6	.2	196
18	Maine	.4	.2	36
18	N. Carolina	.4	.2	218
18	Virginia	1.0	.2	151
19	Kentucky	.4	.1	87
19	Mississippi	.4	.1	63
19	S. Dakota	.4	.1	20
19	Tennessee	.4	.1	114

Source: Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pg. 130.

Rican Americans, the comparative rate is approximately 45% of the state's Spanish-surnamed population.

There are other states where the enrollment percentage is equal or higher than the percentage in the population. In these instances the Spanish-surnamed population in the state is less than one-half of one percent. These states are Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina.

In 1972 the rank order of Chicano enrollment by state in absolute terms did not alter for the five Southwestern states. The rank order of the other states did change although not dramatically (See Tables 15 and 16). If we use the representation rate by comparing enrollment to population there are changes in the seven states with a highly visible Chicano population. Arizona is still the only state that has a higher percentage of Chicanos enrolled than the percentage of Chicanos in the general population but New York has moved into second position by a significant margin with over 69% relative

Table 15

Undergraduate Enrollment, Full-Time In Institutions Of Higher Education

State Summaries, 1972

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State*	Total Minorities	%	% in State*	Whites	%	% in State*	Total	%
Alabama	320	.4	.3	18,205	22.8	19.7	61,541	77.2	73.3	79,746	100.0
Arizona	6,109	7.8	6.3	11,144	14.3	15.1	67,010	85.7	84.9	78,154	100.0
Arkansas	52	.1	.2	7,648	15.6	18.7	41,365	84.4	81.3	49,013	100.0
California	40,912	6.9	15.5	113,064	19.1	25.6	478,040	80.9	74.4	591,104	100.0
Colorado	4,260	6.4	13.0	7,306	11.1	16.9	58,249	88.9	83.1	65,555	100.0
Connecticut	769	1.0	.2	4,393	6.2	6.6	66,260	93.8	93.4	70,653	100.0
Delaware	41	.2	1.1	1,740	11.3	15.8	13,629	88.7	84.2	15,369	100.0
D.C.	348	1.0	2.1	13,206	39.1	73.9	20,527	60.9	26.1	33,733	100.0
Florida	4,206	2.6	6.6	20,692	13.1	22.2	137,734	86.9	77.8	158,426	100.0
Georgia	231	.2	.6	15,832	17.4	26.7	74,922	82.6	85.2	90,754	100.0
Idaho	188	.9	2.4	783	3.9	4.0	19,195	96.1	96.0	19,978	100.0
Illinois	3,428	1.1	3.3	40,023	13.5	16.6	256,053	86.5	83.4	296,076	100.0
Indiana	1,173	.8	2.3	8,281	6.2	9.3	125,967	93.8	90.7	134,248	100.0
Iowa	320	.2	.6	3,344	2.8	2.0	114,335	97.2	98.0	117,679	100.0
Kansas	754	.9	2.1	5,389	7.1	7.5	70,674	92.9	92.5	76,063	100.0
Kentucky	176	.2	.4	5,176	7.3	7.8	65,727	92.7	92.2	70,903	100.0
Louisiana	784	.7	1.9	29,681	26.7	31.9	81,661	73.3	68.1	111,342	100.0
Maine	77	.2	.4	512	1.6	1.0	31,738	98.4	99.0	32,250	100.0
Maryland	1,066	.9	1.4	16,461	14.6	19.7	96,489	85.4	80.3	112,950	100.0
Mass.	1,512	.7	1.1	11,287	5.9	4.6	179,963	94.1	95.4	191,250	100.0
Michigan	1,890	.7	1.5	26,319	10.3	13.1	228,952	89.7	86.9	255,271	100.0

Table 15

Undergraduate Enrollment (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State*	Total Minorities	%	% in State*	Whites	%	% in State*	Total	%
Minnesota	390	.3	.6	3,394	3.1	2.3	104,383	96.9	97.7	107,777	100.0
Mississippi	168	.2	.4	17,283	26.8	37.6	47,186	73.2	62.4	64,469	100.0
Missouri	544	.4	.9	8,843	7.7	11.5	106,407	92.3	88.5	115,250	100.0
Montana	95	.4	1.1	912	4.3	5.4	20,169	95.7	94.6	21,081	100.0
Nebraska	327	.7	1.4	1,699	3.8	4.7	43,122	96.2	95.3	44,821	100.0
Nevada	104	1.2	5.6	565	6.9	13.5	7,660	93.1	86.5	8,225	100.0
[illegible]pshire	131	.5	.4	768	3.1	.9	24,020	96.9	99.1	24,788	100.0
[illegible]ersey	2,608	2.1	1.9	16,140	13.0	13.0	107,881	87.0	87.0	124,021	100.0
[illegible] Mexico	6,031	19.3	40.1	7,585	24.4	49.4	23,531	75.6	50.6	31,116	100.0
New York	16,378	3.4	4.9	63,924	13.5	17.6	410,888	86.5	82.4	474,812	100.0
N. Carolina	355	.2	.4	29,323	19.8	23.6	118,640	80.2	76.4	147,963	100.0
N. Dakota	29	.1	.3	657	2.7	3.1	24,010	97.3	96.9	24,667	100.0
Ohio	1,047	.4	1.3	23,521	9.0	11.4	237,124	91.0	89.4	260,645	100.0
Oklahoma	410	.4	1.4	9,720	11.4	12.0	75,867	88.6	88.0	85,587	100.0
Oregon	583	.8	1.7	3,973	5.6	4.2	67,406	94.4	95.8	71,379	100.0
Pennsylvania	1,127	.4	.4	15,733	5.6	9.3	262,915	94.4	90.7	278,648	100.0
Rhode Island	660	2.3	.7	1,831	6.6	4.4	25,807	93.4	95.6	27,638	100.0
S. Carolina	55	.0	.4	10,037	17.4	31.9	47,601	82.6	68.9	57,638	100.0
S. Dakota	30	.1	.4	651	3.0	5.6	21,128	97.0	94.4	21,779	100.0
Tennessee	136	.1	.4	13,677	13.5	16.4	87,851	86.5	83.6	101,528	100.0
Texas	27,231	9.1	18.4	57,755	19.3	31.2	240,979	80.7	68.8	298,734	100.0
Utah	762	1.3	4.1	2,265	4.0	6.3	53,937	96.0	93.7	56,202	101.0

Table 15

Undergraduate Enrollment (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State*	Total Minorities	%	% in State*	Whites	%	% in State*	Total	%
Vermont	108	.5	.6	526	2.6	1.0	19,663	97.4	99.0	20,189	100.0
Virginia	332	.3	1.0	16,278	15.5	20.0	88,813	84.5	80.0	105,091	100.0
Washington	1,596	1.3	2.1	9,591	7.9	6.4	112,237	92.1	93.4	121,828	100.0
West Virginia	62	.1	.4	2,399	4.8	4.5	48,006	95.2	94.5	50,405	100.0
Wisconsin	742	.5	.9	5,421	4.0	4.4	131,109	96.0	95.6	136,530	100.0
Wyoming	183	1.8	3.6	428	4.3		9,448	95.7	91.8	9,876	100.0
U.S. SUMMARY TOTAL	138,840	2.4		685,385	12.4		4,857,819	87.6		5,543,204	100.0

Source: Office for Civil Rights, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data From Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1972, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OCR-74-13, 1974, pp. 79-80.

*1970 Census Data

Table 16

Rank Order By Percentages Of Spanish-surnamed Undergraduate Enrollment By State, 1972

Rank	State	% in Population*	Enrollment	
			%	Number
1	New Mexico	40.1	19.3	6,031
2	Texas	18.4	9.1	27,231
3	Arizona	6.3	7.8	6,109
4	California	15.5	6.9	40,912
5	Colorado	13.0	6.4	4,260
6	New York	4.9	3.4	16,378
7	Florida	6.6	2.6	4,206
8	New Jersey	1.9	2.1	2,608
9	Wyoming	5.6	1.8	183
10	Utah	4.1	1.3	762
10	Washington	2.1	1.3	1,596
11	Nevada	5.6	1.2	104
12	Illinois	3.3	1.1	3,428
13	Connecticut	.2	1.0	769
13	D.C.	2.1	1.0	348
14	Kansas	2.1	0.9	754
14	Maryland	1.4	0.9	1,066
14	Idaho	2.4	0.9	188
15	Indiana	2.3	0.8	1,173
16	Louisiana	1.9	0.7	784
17	Vermont	.6	0.5	108
17	New Hampshire	.4	0.5	131
17	Wisconsin	.9	0.5	742
18	Montana	1.1	0.4	95
18	Oklahoma	1.4	0.4	410
18	Alabama	.3	0.4	320
18	Pennsylvania	.4	0.4	1,127
18	Ohio	1.3	0.4	1,047
19	Virginia	1.0	0.3	332

Source: Office for Civil Rights, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1972, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OCR-74-13, 1974, pp. 79-80.

*1970 Census Data

representation. Texas and Colorado are approaching half (49.4 and 49.2% respectively) and New Mexico dropped in rank to fifth although there was a slight increase in the percentage of Chicanos enrolled. Florida was the only one of the seven states that showed a drop in the percentage of Spanish-surnamed people enrolled. In general all of the Southwestern states and New York increased the percentage representation of Chicanos enrolled but only New York had a dramatic increase.

It is fair to conclude that those states with a relatively high concentration of Chicanos did not significantly increase enrollment. So long as this is the case it is unlikely that there will be a major change in the relative presence of Chicanos in higher education in the nation. The fact that over 75% of the Chicanos enrolled in 1972 were enrolled in those seven states is indicative that the rate of enrollment in those states is a critical element to Chicano enrollment on a national level.

Normative data developed by the American

Council on Education for geographical distribution of freshmen between 1971 and 1974 shows very slight change. While Chicanos are becoming slightly more visible in institutions of higher education in the Midwest, the overwhelming majority remain in the West. Similarly, Puerto Rican Americans as would be expected, are concentrated in the East.

Select States. Table 17 shows data from select states for 1970 enrollment by year enrolled. The states included in the tables are the five Southwestern states normally associated with Chicanos/Mexican Americans as well as Florida and New York because of the Cuban and Puerto Rican American populations, respectively (See Table 17).

Note that the figures in Table 17 differ slightly from those in Table 13 and 14 since different sources are involved.

From the figures in Table 17, a pattern emerges for first year enrollment. Four of the Southwestern states (except New Mexico) have between 7.3% and 8.7% Spanish-surnamed. Arizona with an 8.0% Spanish-surnamed first year enrollment is over-represented in

Table 17

Enrollment By Year Of Attendance In Institutions
Of Higher Education, 1970
Select States

	Undergraduate Year Enrolled				
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Total
ARIZONA					
Spanish-surnamed	2,333	1,013	498	413	4,257
(6.3%)*	8.0%	7.0%	5.4%	4.7%	6.9%
Total Minority	4,225	1,747	895	729	7,596
(15.1%)	14.5%	12.0%	9.7%	8.4%	12.4%
Whites	24,842	12,784	8,289	7,994	53,909
(84.9%)	85.5%	88.0%	90.3%	91.6%	87.6%
Total	29,067	14,531	9,184	8,723	61,505
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
CALIFORNIA					
Spanish-surnamed	19,841	9,753	3,701	2,602	35,897
(15.5%)	7.6%	6.6%	3.9%	3.4%	6.2%
Total Minority	52,649	26,913	13,029	9,813	102,404
(25.6%)	20.1%	18.3%	13.6%	12.8%	17.7%
Whites	209,210	119,786	81,493	66,942	477,431
(74.4%)	79.9%	81.7%	86.2%	87.2%	82.3%
Total	261,859	146,699	94,522	76,755	579,835
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
COLORADO					
Spanish-surnamed	2,557	952	414	361	4,284
(13.0%)	7.3%	4.8%	2.9%	3.0%	5.2%
Total Minority	4,389	1,746	943	776	7,854
(16.9%)	12.5%	8.8%	6.5%	6.6%	9.6%
Whites	30,822	18,137	13,579	11,259	73,797
(83.1%)	87.5%	91.2%	93.5%	93.6%	90.4%
Total	35,211	19,883	14,522	12,035	81,651
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 17 (continued)

Enrollment by Year Of Attendance In Institutions
of Higher Education, 1970
Select States

	Undergraduate Year Enrolled				
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Total
FLORIDA					
Spanish-surnamed	2,100	1,549	617	561	4,827
(6.6%)	3.3%	3.5%	2.6%	2.9%	3.2%
Total Minority	9,393	5,239	2,241	1,953	18,826
(22.2%)	14.8%	12.0%	9.6%	10.1%	12.6%
Whites	54,331	38,449	21,173	17,312	131,155
(77.8%)	85.2%	88.0%	90.4%	89.9%	87.4%
Total	63,614	43,688	23,414	19,265	149,981
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
NEW MEXICO					
Spanish-surnamed	2,297	1,692	912	667	5,568
(40.1%)	20.4%	19.9%	17.1%	15.3%	18.9%
Total Minority	2,899	2,094	1,125	837	6,955
(49.4%)	25.8%	24.8%	21.1%	19.2%	23.7%
Whites	8,343	6,358	4,215	3,514	22,430
(50.6%)	74.2%	75.2%	78.9%	80.8%	76.3%
Total	11,242	8,452	5,340	4,351	29,385
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
NEW YORK					
Spanish-surnamed	5,463	2,397	1,008	687	9,555
(4.9%)	3.3%	1.9%	1.2%	1.0%	2.2%
Total Minority	22,221	10,497	4,748	3,216	40,682
(17.6%)	13.3%	8.5%	5.9%	4.6%	9.2%
Whites	144,666	112,925	76,078	66,351	400,020
(82.4%)	86.7%	91.5%	94.1%	95.4%	90.8%
Total	166,887	123,422	80,826	69,567	440,702
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 17 (continued)

Enrollment By Year Of Attendance In Institutions
Of Higher Education, 1970
Select States

	Undergraduate Year Enrolled				
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Total
TEXAS					
Spanish-surnamed	10,537	5,663	3,077	2,543	22,227
(18.4%)	8.7%	7.8%	6.2%	5.2%	7.5%
Total Minority	22,537	11,902	6,787	6,854	48,080
(31.2%)	17.9%	16.3%	13.6%	14.1%	16.2%
Whites	103,346	61,036	43,074	41,596	249,052
(68.8%)	82.1%	83.7%	86.4%	85.9%	83.8%
Total	125,883	72,938	49,861	48,450	297,132
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Urban Education Inc., HEW-Constituent Institutions, pp. 141, 142, 144, 152, 155, 159.

*Percent in population

comparison with the population percentage (6.3%). In contrast, the remaining states shown are substantially under-represented. Texas has the greatest imbalance with first year enrollment equivalent to 47% of the representation in the state. California is next with 49%, followed by Florida and New Mexico at 50%, Colorado (56%) and New York (67%). The states with the greatest percentage of Chicanos in the general population (New Mexico, Texas, and California in that order) tend to have the greatest disparity between general population and first year enrollment percentages.[4] From this we can induce a general rule. There is a tendency for the chances, of the number of Spanish-surnamed people to be enrolled in institutions of higher education, to diminish as the percentage of Spanish-surnamed people in the population increases. While this clearly is not an absolute rule (Florida being the notable exception), it is obviously a strong propensity.

Table 17 can also provide some insight into the subject of retention and/or attrition. One must initially recall that Spanish-

surnamed individuals in the country as a whole are heavily concentrated in two-year colleges (See Table 5). Further, this is true for the years 1971-1974 as well as for 1970 (See Table 9). Although there has been a gain in four-year college enrollment, this does not affect the distribution. Because many individuals, regardless of their field of study, who enroll in two-year colleges do not continue beyond that experience, there will be a "natural" attrition. The concentration of Chicanos in the two-year colleges predisposes a higher rate of attrition than other groups less concentrated in two-year colleges. We can, therefore, anticipate higher levels of attrition for Chicanos before a closer perusal of the data is made.

A good deal of caution needs to be exercised in generalizing from the data about reasons for attrition. The difference in attrition between Spanish-surnamed and others is shown. In general terms the first two years in higher education have the highest rate of attrition for all groups. That is, once into the third year the attrition rate drops markedly.

A comparison of enrollment figures between the first and second year and between the second and third year shows differences in attrition between states. The drop in enrollment between years one and two as compared with other years is the greatest in Arizona, Colorado and Texas. That is, within these three states the highest attrition occurs between the first and second years. California, Florida, New Mexico and New York have their sharpest drop in enrollment between the second and third year with the single exception of Whites in California where the higher drop occurs between years one and two.

By the third year, there are only two instances in the data shown in Table 17 where the enrollment is half what it was in the first year. Those occur in New Mexico and New York for the White population. Over the seven states shown, the Spanish-surnamed enrollment by the third year has dropped an average of 75.3%. This compares closely with the attrition for total minorities of 74.1%. The data shows substantial disparity with the Whites whose average drop in the third year

is 57.1% of enrollment was for the first year.

Thus by the third year it is evident that Spanish-surnamed enrollment not only begins at a lower relative rate than does that of Whites, but also the retention rate is lower. The disparity between the two grows with each year of enrollment. By the fourth year the average drop for the seven states is as follows: Spanish-surnamed 80.4%, Total Minority 78.8% and Whites 62.3%. Over the four years the sharpest drops in Spanish-surnamed enrollment occur in New York (87.4%), California (86.9%), Colorado (85.9%), and Arizona (82.3%). The same pattern applies to Total Minorities with whom the Spanish-surnamed figures closely compare. The highest drops for Whites occur in Florida (68.1%). California (68.0%), Arizona (67.8%), and Colorado (63.5%).

A comparison of the order or rank of first year enrollments relative to percent in population, with fourth year enrollments relative to percent in population yields the following (listed in descending order with

those with undergraduate enrollment percentages most closely approximating general population percentages occurring first):

Table 18

Rank Order By Percentage Of Spanish-surnamed First And Fourth Year And Total Undergraduate Enrollment By Select States, 1970

First Year	Fourth Year	Total Enrollment
Arizona	Arizona	Arizona
New York	Florida	Florida
Colorado	New Mexico	New Mexico
New Mexico	Texas	New York
Florida	Colorado	Texas
California	California	Colorado
Texas	New York	California

In terms of enrollment of Chicanos in higher education, the comparison shows clearly that Arizona has the most relative success and California the least. Even this conclusion, however, is tentative.

The data does not show actual attrition nor does it provide information about success and failure. A longitudinal study of Chicano enrollment is essential before valid assertions can be made about attrition/retention. While we do know that the percentages for entering freshmen have held relatively steady between 1970 and 1974, we do not have adequate data for the second, third, and fourth year. There is also a lack of information on the characteristics of transmission from two-year to four-year colleges. The data only gives a sense of what is occurring but reliance can be given to the general trends mentioned above.

The 1972 enrollment data that is available does not have a year by year breakdown, making comparisons for the first and fourth years impossible. It is possible, however, to make a comparison for total enrollment. (See Table 19).

The order of status used in Table 19 is by relative representation. Arizona continues to be more successful at overall enrollment. The table verifies that by 1972 the first year

Table 19

Rank Order By Percentage Of Spanish-surnamed Total Undergraduate Enrollment By Select States, 1970, 1972

1970	1972
Arizona	Arizona
Florida	New York
New Mexico	Texas
New York	Colorado
Texas	New Mexico
Colorado	California
California	Florida

enrollment activities reflected in Table 18 have begun to hold sway for New York and Colorado. It is difficult to understand the reasons for the shift in order but one thing is clearly suggested. California and Florida are not as aggressively pursuing Chicano-Spanish-surnamed enrollment as are the other of these select states.

Chicano enrollment patterns need to be subjected to closer scrutiny to allow for

more intelligent assessments than are possible with the existing data. It may well be that recruitment in the secondary schools is the main cause for limited growth in enrollment into higher education. The question of "qualified" versus "special admission" students is not an issue since community colleges are an alternative. It may well be that recruiting offices in higher education are the main cause of enrollment patterns or it may be the lack of adequate financial aid. All of these are involved to one degree or another but those that weigh heaviest must be determined if there is to be appropriate planning.

Enrollment by Field of Study. The data for enrollment by field of study is restricted to total enrollment for 1972. Table 20 shows the distribution for the nation. Table 21 shows Spanish-surnamed only and the percentage of total Spanish-surnamed that each field constitutes. The data is from the Office for Civil Rights and includes both graduate and undergraduate enrollment. All are presented in this section since most of the data used

to discuss graduate enrollment of Chicanos are from other sources and are restricted specifically to graduates. Undergraduates constitute 95.9% of Chicano enrollment so the distribution figures shown here most certainly reflect the dominant trends in field of study for undergraduates. It is also important to note that the total enrollment reflected in the data in Table 20 accounts for only slightly more than 35% of total enrollment for 1972. In each field of study listed, save one, the White enrollment accounts for 89% or more of the people in the field. Since the provision of this information is voluntary there are several conclusions that can be reached. First, Chicanos and other minorities are more willing than Whites to provide this information. Second, among White students those in the Liberal Arts/Arts and Sciences category are the least likely to indicate their field of study. While the lack of response among White students in the Liberal Arts/Arts and Sciences compromises much of the potential significance of the data there are still some conclusions that can be reached by looking at the Spanish-

surnamed enrollment alone (See Table 21).

Most evident is an overwhelming majority (85.4%) of Chicanos enrolled in the liberal Arts/Arts and Sciences. The second most popular field for Chicanos is Education (3.8%) with Business and Physical Sciences/Engineering/Applied Technology (3.1%) not far behind. The Fine Arts/Architecture is next (1.2%) with the remainder all having less than one percent enrolled. Clearly a more even distribution is desirable but this data provides little insight into the reasons for the heavy emphasis on the Liberal Arts/Arts and Sciences, and the poor distribution in the other fields.

Graduate Enrollment

Trends evident from the perusal of enrollment in schools and in undergraduate institutions of higher education foreshadow what occurs in graduate schools. The reader will recall that the diminution of Chicano or Spanish-surnamed enrollment in schools begins to occur at a substantially greater rate than others by the 14-15 years old age bracket.

Table 20

U.S. Enrollment By Field Of Study
Graduate And Undergraduate, 1972

Field of Study	Spanish-surnamed		Total Minority		Whites		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Liberal Arts/Arts and Sciences	118,568	18.5	609,467	95.3	30,073	4.7	639,540	100.0
Physical Sciences/Engineering/ Applied Technology	4,250	1.7	18,879	7.9	220,667	92.1	239,546	100.0
Agriculture	575	.7	4,026	5.2	73,557	94.8	77,583	100.0
Business	4,262	1.4	26,253	8.8	271,639	91.2	297,892	100.0
Professional: Law	1,055	1.3	5,262	6.9	71,006	93.1	76,268	100.0
Professional: Medicine	609	1.1	4,109	7.7	49,218	92.3	53,327	100.0
Professional: Veterinary Medicine	26	.3	486	7.3	6,171	92.7	6,657	100.0
Professional: Dentistry	210	1.0	1,433	7.0	18,930	93.0	20,363	100.0
Professional: Theology	164	.7	1,124	4.9	21,705	95.1	22,829	100.0
Other Professional/Semi-Professional	402	1.2	2,833	8.5	30,431	91.5	33,264	100.0
Fine Arts/Architecture	1,629	1.3	8,752	7.4	109,570	92.6	118,322	100.0
Nursing and Health Services/Sciences	706	1.0	5,678	8.3	62,331	91.7	68,009	100.0
Social and Behavioral Sciences	1,107	1.3	6,946	8.3	76,805	91.7	83,751	100.0
Education	5,221	1.4	38,956	11.0	315,035	89.0	353,991	100.0

Source: Office for Civil Rights, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data From Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1972, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OCR-74-13, pg. 109.

Table 21

U.S. Enrollment By Field Of Study
Spanish-surnamed, 1972

Field of Study	Number	%
Liberal Arts/Arts and Sciences	118,568	85.4
Physical Sciences/Engineering/ Applied Technology	4,250	3.1
Agriculture	575	0.4
Business	4,262	3.1
Professional: Law	1,055	0.8
Professional: Medicine	609	0.4
Professional: Veterinary Medicine	26	0.0
Professional: Dentistry	210	0.2
Professional: Theology	164	0.1
Other Professional/Semi-Professional	402	0.3
Fine Arts/Architecture	1,629	1.2
Nursing and Health Services/Sciences	706	0.5
Social and Behavioral Sciences	1,107	0.8
Education	5,221	3.8
Total	138,784	100.0

Source: Office for Civil Rights, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data From Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1972, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OCR-74-13, pg. 109.

Further, the gap between Chicanos and others increases with time. That pattern continues to hold at the graduate level. Table 22 shows national figures for 1970 for the Spanish-surnamed and others in graduate and professional schools. Table 23 shows the 1972 data for graduate and professional schools. The 1972 data are presented differently since the "professional schools" category in 1972 has a different data base than does the 1970 data. While the Office for Civil Rights publication (OCR-74-13) does include some definitions it is unclear just precisely what is meant by "professional schools." The earlier publication (OCR-72-8) isolates medical, dental, and law school and these are certainly part of the sum of professional school enrollment figures in OCR-74-13. It is evident, however, that they are not the totality. Thus, here again are data problems. The 1970 enrollment figures for "graduate schools" almost certainly include data that is counted in the 1972 survey under "professional schools." The result is that the only figures that are comparable from these two tables are the "totals." Later in this section

historical data is presented to provide a comparative perspective that utilizes data with a common base. In that instance it will be possible to see overall enrollment figures with graduate and professional enrollments combined since that is the only common base for the three surveys.

The total enrollment percentage of Chicanos in undergraduate status compared with the total enrollment percentage of those in graduate and professional status shows a significant drop in 1968 (1.7% to 0.8%), 1970 (2.1% to 1.2%), and in 1972 (2.4% to 1.4%). In all of the surveys it is apparent that the percentage of Chicanos who matriculate into graduate status is less than that of others. Table 24, based on common sources of data, shows a comparison of total enrollments between graduate and professional and undergraduate status. The percentage of Chicano undergraduates who continue in school more than doubled between 1968 and 1970 but tapered off considerably between 1970 and 1972. The same is true for the Total Minority and Whites category. From the standpoint of relative

Table 22

Summary Graduate And Professional School Enrollment
For Spanish-surnamed And Others, 1970*

	Spanish-surnamed	Total Minority	Whites	Total
Medical Schools	340	2,903	39,598	42,501
	.8**	6.8	93.2	100.0
Dental Schools	100	929	14,053	14,982
	.7	6.2	93.8	100.0
Law Schools	706	3,629	58,560	62,189
	1.1	5.8	94.2	100.0
Graduate Schools	4,830	30,033	362,329	392,362
	1.2	7.7	92.3	100.0
Total	5,976	37,494	474,540	512,034
	1.2	7.3	92.7	100.0

*Source: Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pp. 195, 199, 202, 205.

**Percentages

Table 23

Summary Graduate And Professional School Enrollment
For Spanish-surnamed And Others, 1972*

	Spanish-surnamed	Total Minority	Whites	Total
Professional Schools	2,573	13,990	165,459	179,449
	1.4**	7.8	92.2	100.0
Graduate Schools	5,903	37,281	368,812	406,093
	1.5	9.2	90.8	100.0
Total	8,476	51,271	534,271	585,542
	1.4	8.8	91.2	100.0

*Source: Office for Civil Rights, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1972, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OCR-74-13, pg. 76.

**Percentages

gain Chicanos have made very little progress. It would be interesting to find out why so few Chicanos continue in school. Is it because they do not apply? Is it because they do not qualify? Is it because of financial reasons? We know that the level of indebtedness for Chicanos by the end of undergraduate studies is higher than for others. More study is clearly needed in this area.

Chicanos evidently continue into graduate and professional school at a substantially lower rate than other minorities and at nearly half the rate of whites. Thus the trend that begins at the 14-15 years old level continues into graduate and professional schools. The Spanish-surnamed population are not simply under-represented in enrollment in higher education but are increasingly under-represented as the level of matriculation advances.

Table 25 shows by state the 1970 distribution of Spanish-surnamed enrollment in graduate and professional schools (except medical, dental, and law).

As indicated earlier, the data on graduate and professional enrollment available for

Table 24

Graduate And Professional Enrollment
As Percent Of Undergraduate

	Year	Total Undergraduate	Total Graduate and Professional	Percentage
Spanish-surnamed	1968	49,205	1,234	2.5
	1970	98,453	5,680	5.8
	1972	130,840	8,476	6.5
Total Minority	1968	294,316	7,948	2.7
	1970	504,118	36,152	7.2
	1972	685,385	51,271	7.5
Whites	1968	2,642,850	141,383	5.3
	1970	4,346,285	455,872	10.5
	1972	4,857,819	534,271	11.0

Table 25

Full-Time Graduate And Professional School Enrollment
(Except Medical, Dental and Law Schools) 1970
State Summaries

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Alabama	31	.7	.3	939	19.7	26.7	3,825	80.3	73.3	4,764	100.0
Arizona	104	1.8	6.3	220	3.9	15.1	5,406	[illegible]	84.9	5,626	100.0
Arkansas	15	.6	.2	148	6.4	18.7	2,168	93.6	81.3	2,316	100.0
California	1,442	2.6	15.3	5,490	10.0	25.6	49,156	90.0	74.4	54,646	100.0
Colorado	154	3.2	13.0	437	9.2	16.9	4,333	90.8	83.1	4,770	100.0
Connecticut	18	1.1	.2	190	11.5	6.6	1,463	88.5	93.4	1,653	100.0
Delaware	1	.1	.1	30	3.3	15.8	880	96.7	84.2	910	100.0
D.C.	94	1.5	[illegible]	1,349	22.2	73.9	4,716	77.8	26.1	6,065	100.0
Floride	207	3.4	6.6	614	10.1	22.2	5,470	89.9	77.8	6,084	100.0
Georgia	57	.6	.6	1,396	14.8	26.7	8,047	85.2	73.3	9,443	100.0
Idaho	3	.5	2.4	37	6.4	4.0	538	93.6	96.0	575	100.0
Illinois	205	.8	3.3	1,966	8.0	16.6	22,545	92.0	83.4	24,511	100.0
Indiana	63	.5	2.3	599	4.9	9.3	11,670	95.1	90.7	12,269	100.0
Iowa	44	.5	.6	177	2.0	2.0	8,655	98.0	98.0	8,832	100.0
Kansas	66	1.0	2.1	406	6.4	7.5	5,915	93.6	92.5	6,321	100.0
Kentucky	13	.4	.4	125	3.5	7.8	3,465	96.5	92.2	3,590	100.0
Louisiana	64	1.1	1.9	448	7.6	31.9	5,448	92.4	68.1	5,856	100.0
Maine	3	.4	.4	5	.7	1.0	732	99.3	99.0	737	100.0
Maryland	63	1.0	1.4	729	11.4	19.7	5,689	88.6	80.3	6,418	100.0
Mass.	157	.8	1.1	1,006	5.0	4.6	19,309	95.0	95.4	20,315	100.0
Michigan	85	.6	1.5	1,435	9.3	12.1	13,962	90.7	[illegible]	15,357	100.0

Table 25

Full-Time Graduate And Professional School 1970 (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Minnesota	38	.4	.6	418	4.0	2.3	9,951	96.0	97.7	10,369	100.0
Mississippi	3	.1	.4	446	16.3	37.6	2,284	83.7	62.4	2,730	100.0
Missouri	118	1.0	.9	618	5.1	11.5	11,616	94.9	88.5	12,234	100.0
Montana	2	1.3	1.1	4	2.7	5.4	145	97.3	94.6	149	100.0
Nebraska	7	.3	1.4	90	3.3	4.7	2,673	96.7	95.3	2,763	100.0
Nevada	10	.6	5.6	33	2.0	13.5	1,586	98.0	86.5	1,619	100.0
N. Hampshire	2	.2	.4	17	1.6	.9	1,035	98.4	99.1	1,032	100.0
New Jersey	54	.6	1.9	411	4.6	13.0	8,428	95.4	87.0	8,839	100.0
New Mexico	141	7.4	40.1	231	10.6	39.4	1,952	89.4	50.6	2,181	100.0
New York	493	1.3	4.9	2,947	7.6	17.6	35,697	92.4	82.4	38,644	100.0
N. Carolina	47	.6	.4	393	4.6	23.6	8,061	95.4	76.4	8,454	100.0
N. Dakota	1	.1	.3	12	.7	3.1	1,762	99.3	96.9	1,774	100.0
Ohio	78	.4	1.3	1,337	6.9	11.4	18,179	93.1	89.6	19,516	100.0
Oklahoma	32	.6	1.4	465	8.1	12.0	5,300	91.9	88.0	5,765	100.0
Oregon	53	.8	1.7	353	5.6	4.2	5,908	94.4	95.8	6,261	100.0
Pennsylvania	130	.7	.4	1,437	8.0	9.3	16,584	92.0	90.7	18,021	100.0
Rhode Island	14	1.0	.7	39	2.9	4.4	1,302	97.1	95.6	1,341	100.0
S. Carolina	10	.3	.4	81	2.7	31.9	2,885	97.3	68.9	2,966	100.0
S. Dakota	1	.2	.4	18	3.2	5.6	542	96.8	94.4	560	100.0
Tennessee	16	.3	.4	486	9.2	16.4	4,823	90.8	83.6	5,309	100.0
Texas	534	3.7	18.4	1,265	8.8	31.2	13,178	91.2	68.8	14,447	100.0
Utah	28	.5	4.1	100	1.9	6.3	5,116	98.1	93.7	5,216	100.0

Table 25

Full-Time Graduate And Professional School 1970 (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Vermont	7	.9	.6	33	4.4	1.0	716	95.6	99.0	749	100.0
Virginia	18	.4	1.0	357	7.2	20.0	4,610	92.8	80.0	4,967	100.0
Washington	28	.5	2.1	187	3.5	6.4	5,199	96.5	93.4	5,386	100.0
Wisconsin	55	.6	.9	505	5.1	4.4	9,405	94.9	95.6	9,910	100.0

Source: Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pg. 195.

1972 was compiled under a different data base or type of control. That is, the 1972 data has separate listings for graduate and professional. This, of course, makes comparisons impractical. Therefore, in order to avoid complications, the 1972 State Summaries data is presented in the appendix (See Appendix E).

Because of the greater propensity of graduate schools to recruit on a national and international bases, it is difficult to generalize about geographical distribution. As opposed to undergraduate schools, the number and capacity of graduate schools have different variability from state to state than do undergraduate schools. Still one is forced to assume that states with a significant Spanish-surnamed population will have greater numbers and higher percentages of Spanish-surnamed individuals enrolled. Selecting the same states considered in the section on undergraduate enrollment, some comparisons can be made. The states are listed in two orders (See Table 26). They are shown in decreasing order beginning with the one with the highest percentage of total enrollment

as well as, in similar order, with the one whose percentage enrollment most closely approximates the percentage of Spanish-surnamed in the state.

The 1972 data for graduate and professional schools are similar to one another for percentage of total enrollment and differ somewhat from the 1970 data. Table 27 shows the 1972 ranking with the distinction between graduate and professional schools. As already mentioned, the value of these observations is questionable without additional data. It is interesting to note, however, that Arizona consistently is more successful at approaching "parity" in terms of proportionate representation than the other states of the Southwest.

Distribution by Field of Study. Graduate enrollment distribution by field of study is difficult to assess with precision. Variations occur between data sources especially with regard to absolute sums. Also, the ability and incidence of occurrence for individuals to combine fields of study is difficult to assess. Among researchers grouping

Table 26

Rank Order By States
Of Highest Spanish-surnamed Graduate Enrollment Percentage
And Percentage Enrollment Most Closely Approximating
Spanish-surnamed Population Percentage, 1970

Percentage of Total Enrollment	Percentage of State Population
New Mexico	Florida
Texas	Arizona
Florida	New York
Colorado	Colorado
California	Texas
Arizona	New Mexico
New York	California

Table 27

Rank Order By States
Of Highest Spanish-surnamed Graduate And Professional
School Enrollment Percentage And Percentage Enrollment
Most Closely Approximating Spanish-surnamed
Population Percentage, 1972

Percentage of Total Enrollment		Percentage of State Population	
Graduate	Professional	Graduate	Professional
New Mexico	New Mexico	New York	Arizona
Texas	Texas	Arizona	New Mexico
California	California	New Mexico	Texas
Colorado	Arizona	Florida	California
Arizona	Colorado	California	Colorado
Florida	Florida	Texas	Florida
New York	New York	Colorado	New York

of disciplines also vary from institution to institution. For example, one survey will combine the Physical Sciences and Mathematics while another will list the Physical Sciences separately. Also, data is presented for full and part-time enrollment and other for full-time only. In either case full and part-time are defined in more than one way. In some instances the responses to surveys are not complete and in other instances the sample population includes only doctoral-granting institutions. Because of the magnitude of the figures in each category, the differences described above can be meaningful. For these reasons data from different sources is presented and the reader is warned to exercise more caution in terms of the precision of the numbers with this data than with other data that has been presented.

The first data presented shows 1970 distribution for various ethnic groups in percentages (See Table 28). This data is from a portion (40%) of a sample of schools, but the percentages show close agreement with data from other sources. The data shows the

percentage representation in seven general fields of study. The Spanish-surnamed are best represented in Education, Arts, Humanities and the Social Sciences. Whites, however, constitute over 90% in all of the fields shown. The highest Total Minority representation is 9.4% in Education (See Table 29).

Table 29 is based on 1973 figures for Ph.D. granting institutions only. As can readily be seen, the percentages correspond fairly well with those in Table 28 with minor differences that are at least partly attributable to a different year and sample size. From the former table we are able to sense the percentage distribution within the Spanish-surnamed category (See Table 30).

Clearly the emphasis among Chicanos is Education with the Arts and Humanities being the next most chosen. The Life Sciences and Social Sciences are nearly equally represented while the Physical Sciences/Mathematics and Engineering fare poorly.

The trends indicated in the previous two tables are borne out when one looks at the

Table 28

Graduate School Full- And Part-Time Enrollment By Field Of Study For Various Ethnic Groups, 1970

Field/Study	Whites*	Blacks	American Indians	Orientals	Spanish-surnamed
Business	95.8	2.2	.3	.9	.8
Education	91.6	5.6	.5	.7	1.6
Engineering	96.8	.9	.1	1.6	.6
Arts and Humanities	95.2	2.3	.2	1.0	1.3
Social Science	92.6	5.0	.3	1.0	1.1
Biological Sciences	96.0	1.8	.3	1.1	.8
Physical Sciences	95.6	2.1	.8	1.0	.5

Source: Urban Education Inc., Hamilton Educational Testing Service, pg. 194.

*White Totals were obtained by subtracting Minority Totals from 100%.
All figures are percentages.

Table 29

Enrollment In Ph.D.-Granting Institutions, 1973

Field of Study	Spanish-surnamed	Total Minority	Whites	Total
Physical Sciences and Mathematics	218 0.6*	1,721 5.1	32,354 94.9	34,075 100.0
Engineering	263 0.8	1,688 5.4	29,588 94.6	31,273 100.0
Life Sciences	411 1.0	2,474 6.1	38,405 93.9	40,879 100.0
Social Sciences	426 1.2	2,387 6.7	33,196 93.3	35,583 100.0
Arts and Humanities	794 1.5	2,958 5.5	50,962 94.5	53,920 100.0
Other Fields	769 1.0	6,190 7.7	74,476 92.3	80,666 100.0
Education	1,113 1.2	9,074 9.4	87,494 90.6	96,568 100.0
Total	3,994 1.1	26,492 7.1	346,472 92.9	372,964 100.0

Source: El-Khawas, Elaine H. and Kinzer Joan L. Enrollment of Minority Graduate Students at Ph.D.-Granting Institutions, Higher Education Panel Report 19, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1974.

*Percentage of total

Table 30

Percentage Distribution of Spanish-surnamed Graduate Students By Field Of Study, 1973

Physical Sciences and Mathematics	5.4%
Engineering	6.6
Life Sciences	10.3
Social Sciences	10.7
Arts and Humanities	19.9
Other Fields	19.2
Education	27.9
Total	100.0%

distribution by field of doctorates awarded in 1972-73 as reflected in two different studies. Once again there is the problem of the nature of the data, in this instance the discrimination between sampling size and definition of Chicano or Spanish-surnamed. In one instance the sample size is smaller and distinguishes between native-born and naturalized U.S. citizens. In the other instance the sample size is larger but the category used is Latins which includes Spanish Americans/Mexican Americans/Chicanos/ Puerto Ricans. Nevertheless, the patterns as seen in Tables 31 and 32, for example, hold fairly constant, that is, if the Psychology and Social Sciences figures of Table 32 are combined. The differences that appear between Education and the Arts and Humanities are also reduced if the Chicano and Puerto Rican categories in Table 31 are combined. Thus, in spite of the differences in methodology both tables show a consistent pattern of distribution by field.

The domination of Education and the Arts and Humanities over other fields is evident

Table 31

Doctorates Awarded, 1972-73 By Field
Native-Born U.S. Citizens

Field of Study	Chicano	Puerto Rican American	Total Minority	Whites	Total
Physical Sciences and Mathematics	12 12.9*	3 8.3	75 8.1	2,976 15.1	3,051 14.8
Engineering	1 1.1	3 8.3	41 4.4	1,505 7.6	1,546 7.5
Life Sciences	15 16.1	6 16.7	133 14.3	2,790 14.2	2,923 14.2
Social Sciences	16 17.2	8 22.2	126 13.5	3,619 18.4	3,745 18.1
Arts and Humanities	19 20.4	6 16.7	103 11.1	3,409 17.3	3,512 17.0
Other Fields	--** 	--** 	21 2.2	852 4.3	873 4.2
Education	30 32.3	10 27.8	432 46.4	4,559 23.1	4,991 24.2
Total	93 100.0	36 100.0	931 100.0	19,710 100.0	20,641 100.00

Source: National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, Doctorate Records File, 1974.

*Percentages

**Data not available

Table 32

Percentage Distribution By Field
Among 1973 Doctorate Recipients

Field of Study	Latin	Oriental	Black	American Indian	Whites	Total
Engineering Physical Sciences and Mathematics	14.8	42.1	8.6	15.8	22.8	22.1
Life Sciences	15.9	24.3	9.0	14.9	14.1	14.2
Social Sciences	8.5	10.5	6.5	10.5	10.0	9.8
Psychology	9.1	5.7	3.9	8.8	8.3	8.2
Arts and Humanities	26.7	8.1	9.4	18.4	17.7	17.1
Professions	0.6	3.2	3.1	0.9	4.3	4.3
Education	24.4	6.1	59.5	30.7	22.8	24.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Commission on Human Resources, Minority Groups Among United States Doctorate-Level Scientists, Engineers, and Scholars, 1973, National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, 1974, pg. 13.

and appears consistently in the data. The greatest disparity between Chicanos or Spanish-surnamed and others is and will be for the next couple of years, in the Physical Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering. Enrollment levels show very clearly that Education will continue to dominate as a field of graduate study for Chicanos unless some dramatic incidents or influences alter the pattern. Arts and Humanities do not show a substantial margin over the Social and Life Sciences in doctorates awarded but have nearly twice as large a pool of students to draw from in the future.

It is interesting to note that Education is also dominant for the Total Minority enrollment and that the field of study with the next highest enrollment (excepting "others") is Arts and Humanities. As is the pattern for White enrollment except for one notable difference--the Physical Sciences and Mathematics, where White enrollment is as high as in the Social Sciences, the pattern of enrollment for Total Minority is very similar to that of the Spanish-surnamed. In general,

Whites have a more balanced enrollment than do the other categories.

Medical Schools. Data from different sources for enrollment in medical schools is more in agreement than data for graduate studies in general. Probably this can be attributed to the smaller number of schools and the lower total number of students as well as the more structured nature of medical schools.

Tables 33 and 34 show the growth of medical school enrollment from 1968-69 to 1974-75 academic years. Table 33 includes first year enrollment from 1970-71 through 1974-75. These figures show dramatic changes occurring in medical schools. First, growth of White enrollment has remained even in relation to the overall growth in medical schools. Over the five-year period shown in Table 33, the rate of growth of Total Minority enrollment, both in entering class and in overall enrollment, has been higher than the respective rates for Whites and for the total enrollment. In 1970-71 Total Minority enrollment was 5.7% of the total. By

1974-75 it was 10.4% or nearly double. The greatest rate of growth, however, has been in the Spanish-surnamed category. The Spanish-surnamed percentage of first year enrollment has tripled and the percentage of total enrollment has risen by a factor of over three and a half. Clearly, the complexion of medical schools is changing and just as clearly the greatest rate of growth in enrollment is among the Spanish-surnamed.

It must be stressed, however, that in terms of actual numbers there is no likelihood that we will be faced with a glut of Spanish-surnamed medical doctors. Spanish-surnamed individuals still only comprise 1.8% of the total and 2.4% of first year enrollment. Out of a total of 53,597 medical students there are only 968 Spanish-surnamed.

It should also be stressed that the rate of growth of White enrollment (both in first year and as a whole) and the rate of total enrollment (first year and total) is the same. This indicates the charge that minorities are taking slots from Whites is totally unfounded.

Table 33

First Year And Total Enrollments In Medical Schools
1970-71 To 1974-75*

Year	Chicano Mexican American		Puerto Rican American		Other Hispano		Total Minority		Whites		Total
	1st Yr.	Total	1st Yr.	Total	1st Yr.	Total	1st Yr.	Total	1st Yr.	Total	
1970-71	73	148	27	48	NA		998	2,294	10,350	37,944	11,348
	.6**	.4	.2	.1			8.8	5.7	91.2	94.3	100.0
1971-72	118	252	40	76	NA		1,280	3,072	11,081	40,578	12,361
	1.0	.6	.3	.2			10.4	7.1	89.6	93.0	100.0
1972-73	137	361	44	90	NA		1,437	3,918	12,240	43,448	13,677
	1.0	.8	.3	.2			10.5	8.3	89.5	91.7	100.0
1973-74	174	496	56	123	NA		1,627	4,836	12,497	45,880	14,124
	1.2	1.0	.4	.2			11.5	9.5	88.5	90.5	100.0
1974-75	227	638	69	172	57	158	1,839	5,560	12,924	48,037	14,763
	1.5	1.2	.5	.3	.4	.3	12.4	10.4	87.5	89.6	100.0

*Source: Association of American Colleges, Division of Student Studies, Washington, D.C.

**Percentages

Table 34

Graduate School Enrollment In Medical Schools
By Ethnic Group

Year	Blacks	American Indians	Oriental Americans	Spanish-surnamed
1968-69	783 (2.3%)	9	421 (1.2%)	62 (.2%)
1969-70	1,042 (2.8%)	18	452 (1.2%)	118 (.3%)
1970-71	1,509 (3.8%)	18	571 (1.4%)	196 (.5%)
1970*	1,752 (4.1%)	43 (.1%)	768 (1.8%)	340 (.8%)
1971-72	2,055 (4.7%)	42 (.1%)	647 (1.5%)	328 (.8%)
1972-73	2,583 (5.5%)	69 (.2%)	718 (1.5%)	451 (1.0%)

Source: Urban Education Inc., Dube, Journal of Medical Education, pg. 198.

*Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pg. 198.

Table 35 shows medical school enrollment by state for 1970. States with higher absolute numbers of Spanish-surnamed in medical schools tend to correlate to those states with higher medical school enrollment in general. Exceptions are New Mexico and Florida. California had better representation of Spanish-surnamed in medical schools than in graduate schools. The same is true for Arizona, although this only involves four medical students. Colorado shows only five Chicanos in medical school. New York, which has the second highest number of medical schools in the country, shows 0.5% of its enrollments as Spanish-surnamed.

Generally, Chicano representation in medical schools across the country is growing but is still far from being representative. If, however, growth continues at the present rate (1971-75), Chicanos and Spanish-surnamed people in general will reach parity within the next five years. It should be emphasized, however, that already there are indications that this will not be the case. The recent California court decision involving

Table 35

Medical School Enrollment - Full-Time, 1970
State Summaries

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	Total Minorities	%	Whites	%	Total	%
Alabama	--	--	7	1.9	363	98.1	370	100.0
Arizona	4	2.1	10	5.2	184	94.8	194	100.0
Arkansas	--	--	5	1.2	411	98.8	416	100.0
California	72	2.8	350	13.4	2,260	86.6	2,610	100.0
Colorado	5	1.1	14	3.2	427	96.8	441	100.0
Connecticut	2	.4	26	5.6	436	94.4	462	100.0
D.C.	5	.4	371	28.4	936	71.6	1,307	100.0
Florida	33	4.9	45	6.6	635	93.4	680	100.0
Georgia	6	.7	38	4.3	844	95.7	882	100.0
Illinois	10	.4	106	4.2	2,405	95.8	2,511	100.0
Indiana	3	.4	22	2.6	810	97.4	832	100.0
Iowa	1	.1	13	1.4	892	98.6	905	100.0
Kansas	2	.4	18	3.6	485	96.4	503	100.0
Kentucky	2	.3	8	1.1	731	98.9	739	100.0
Louisiana	11	1.0	28	2.5	1,109	97.5	1,137	100.0
Maryland	1	.2	31	6.3	463	93.7	494	100.0
Mass.	5	.3	96	6.4	1,404	93.6	1,500	100.0
Michigan	81	1.3	703	11.3	5,507	88.7	6,210	100.0
Minnesota	--	--	55	7.5	680	92.5	735	100.0
Mississippi	--	--	6	1.7	343	98.3	349	100.0
Missouri	2	.2	17	1.9	882	98.1	899	100.0
Nebraska	6	.8	21	2.6	779	97.4	800	100.0

Table 35

Medical School Enrollment - Full-Time, 1970 (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	Total Minorities	%	Whites	%	Total	%
New Hampshire	--	--	2	1.9	103	98.1	105	100.0
New Mexico	11	7.6	15	10.3	130	89.7	145	100.0
New York	22	.5	227	4.8	4,469	95.2	4,696	100.0
N. Carolina	--	--	37	3.7	954	96.3	991	100.0
N. Dakota	--	--	--	--	109	100.0	109	100.0
Ohio	1	.1	74	4.2	1,675	95.8	1,749	100.0
Oklahoma	4	.5	26	3.6	706	96.4	732	100.0
Oregon	--	--	12	2.7	433	97.3	445	100.0
Pennsylvania	7	.3	113	4.1	2,675	95.9	2,788	100.0
S. Carolina	--	--	6	1.5	397	98.5	403	100.0
S. Dakota	--	--	--	--	102	100.0	102	100.0
Tennessee	--	--	272	23.9	865	76.1	1,137	100.0
Texas	40	2.6	61	3.9	1,499	96.1	1,560	100.0
Utah	2	.7	5	1.8	271	98.2	276	100.0
Vermont	--	--	1	.4	262	99.6	263	100.0
Virginia	--	--	18	2.1	845	97.9	863	100.0
Washington	1	.3	23	7.5	284	92.5	307	100.0
Wisconsin	1	.1	21	2.5	833	97.5	854	100.0
U.S. SUMMARY TOTALS	340	0.8	2,903	6.8	39,598	93.2	42,501	

Source: Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pg. 199.

the University of California, Davis medical school admission policies will undoubtedly create the same pressures in medical schools that have been created in law schools by the DeFunis decision.

Dental Schools. A glance at Table 36 shows that the Spanish-surnamed enrollment is the same relative proportion of the total in the three year period, 1970 through 1972-73. Spanish-surnamed enrollment grew by nearly a third in absolute numbers over the 1970 figures. The only group that showed a substantial relative increase was Oriental enrollment. The relative representation of Chicanos in dental schools is the lowest of all graduate and professional school enrollments.

Table 37 shows the distribution of dental school enrollment by state. Only three of the previously discussed states have dental school enrollments (California, New York, and Texas). California alone has 42% of the total Spanish-surnamed enrollments, Texas has 10% and New York 7% accounting for 59% of Spanish-surnamed dental students. As

Table 36

Graduate School Enrollment In Dental Schools
For Various Racial And Ethnic Groups

Group	1970*	1972-1973**
Blacks	570	765
	3.8***	4.2
American Indians	17	14
	.1	.1
Orientals	242	409
	1.6	2.2
Spanish-surnamed	100	132
	.7	.7
Total Minority	929	1,320
	6.2	7.2
Whites	14,053	16,894
	93.8	92.8

Source: *Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pg. 201.

**Urban Education Inc., Dental Education Supplement, pg. 201.

***Percentage of total.

is the case with medical schools, and perhaps much more so, the relationship of the percentage of enrollment to the percentage of the total population in the state is an inappropriate measure because of the distribution of schools and the interstate character of enrollment in general. One would suspect, however, that those states with the larger number of dental students would reflect a similar pattern for Chicanos. It does not occur. With the exception of California (which does have both), the size of the total enrollment in the state appears irrelevant in predicting Chicano representation. For example, if the six states which immediately follow California in total enrollment are considered, there is an enrollment of 6,604 which accounts for 44% of total enrollment in the country. There are only 14 Chicanos who account for 0.2% of the total and 14% of total Chicano enrollment in dental schools.

The data presented here for 1970 and 1972-73 shows clearly that some efforts need to be made to make the situation more reasonable. The data does not indicate why the

Table 37

Dental School Enrollment - Full-Time, 1970
State Summaries

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Alabama	2	1.0	.3	5	2.4	26.7	201	97.6	73.3	206	100.0
California	42	2.5	15.5	181	10.9	25.6	1,472	89.1	74.4	1,653	100.0
Connecticut				1	2.2	6.6	45	97.8	93.4	46	100.0
D.C.	1	.1	2.1	309	39.8	73.9	468	60.2	26.1	777	100.0
Georgia	4	1.1	.6	9	2.5	26.7	345	97.5	73.3	354	100.0
Illinois	2	.2	3.3	64	5.1	16.6	1,193	94.9	83.4	1,257	100.0
Indiana	1	.3	2.3	17	4.3	9.3	380	95.7	90.7	397	100.0
Iowa				1	.4	2.0	246	99.6	98.0	247	100.0
Kentucky	1	.2	.4	4	.9	7.8	462	99.1	92.2	466	100.0
Louisiana							145	100.0	68.1	145	100.0
Mass.	1	.2	1.1	21	3.2	4.6	628	96.8	95.4	649	100.0
Michigan	2	.3	1.5	27	3.5	13.1	739	96.5	86.4	766	100.0
Minnesota				7	1.7	2.3	416	98.3	97.6	423	100.0
Missouri	16	3.0	.9	26	4.9	11.5	505	95.1	88.5	531	100.0
Nebraska	3	.7	1.4	7	1.6	4.7	426	98.4	95.3	433	100.0
New Jersey				3	1.3	13.0	227	98.7	87.0	230	100.0
New York	7	.6	4.9	35	2.8	17.6	1,231	97.2	82.4	1,266	100.0
N. Carolina	1	.4	.4	3	1.2	23.6	240	98.8	76.4	243	100.0
Ohio	1	.1	1.3	23	2.5	11.4	887	97.5	89.4	910	100.0
Oregon	1	3.7	1.7	4	14.8	4.2	23	85.2	95.8	27	100.0
Pennsylvania	1	.1	.4	21	1.3	9.5	1,607	98.7	90.7	1,628	100.0

situation in Dentistry is so poor compared to other graduate and professional schools.

Law Schools. As an aggregate, Chicano and Spanish-surnamed representation in law schools has increased between 1970 and 1973-74 (See Table 38). In terms of percentages, by 1973-74, it is nearly half again what it was in 1970 and over twice (2.4) what it was in absolute numbers. Spanish-surnamed enrollment has grown more rapidly than enrollment as a whole and faster than the Total Minority enrollment and the White enrollment in terms of absolute numbers and percentages. Among Spanish-surnamed people, Puerto Rican Americans have had the greatest rate of growth both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of the total--a fact that was hardly avoidable given any recruitment at all. Chicano, Spanish-surnamed as an aggregate, and Total Minority enrollment have all increased proportionately at a greater rate than either the White or the total enrollment. However, as must be apparent by now, the White and total enrollment figures are nearly always identical (because of the disproportionate majority of Whites).

Table 38

Law School Enrollment For Spanish-surnamed Individuals And Others, 1970-74

	1970*	1971-72**	1972-73	1973-74
Spanish-surnamed	706 1.1%	1,156 1.2%	1,446 1.4%	1,681 1.6%
Chicano Mexican American	----	883 .9%	1,072 1.1%	1,259 1.2%
Puerto Rican American	----	94 0.1%	143 .1%	180 .2%
Other Hispano	----	179 .2%	231 .2%	242 .2%
Total Minority	3,629 5.8%	5,520 5.9%	6,723 6.6%	7,570 7.1%
Whites	58,560 94.2%	87,598 94.1%	94,941 93.4%	98,532 92.9%
Total	62,189 100.0%	93,118 100.0%	101,664 100.0%	106,102 100.0%

Source: *Urban Education, Office for Civil Rights data, pg. 205.

**Law School and Bar Admission Requirements. A Review of Legal Education in the United States--Fall, 1973. Chicago, American Bar Association, 1974.

The Spanish-surnamed enrollment in law schools began in 1970 at a substantially greater proportion on the whole than either medical or dental school enrollment. And while law school enrollment has grown, it has not grown at as rapid a rate as medical schools, but because of the initial margin, is likely reflecting a better Chicano situation (this was clearly the case in 1973-74).

Thus it is possible to conclude from the data that Chicanos have better representation in law schools than in medical or dental schools. Similarly we can anticipate that at the going rate, medical schools will soon demonstrate the most favorable rate of representation of all professional and graduate schools in terms of the proportion of Chicanos enrolled. And unless the rate of growth of enrollment in law schools begins to grow, they will soon be in the same relative position as dental schools.

Table 39 shows full-time law school enrollment by state. In this instance, as is the case with graduate schools and to a far greater degree with professional schools, it

is dangerous to generalize too much. Law schools are more numerous than the other professional schools discussed. They also recruit on an interstate basis. Nonetheless, law school enrollment statistics reveal telling patterns in states with a significant Chicano percentage in the population.

The seven states previously considered (five Southwestern, Florida, and New York) have over 75% of the total Spanish-surnamed enrollment in law schools. With the exception of Colorado and New York the percentage representations within these states are the highest in the country. New Mexico has the highest representation of Chicanos (9.6%), but the total enrollment is among the lowest in the country (only six other states have fewer law students enrolled). In contrast, New York with the largest number of law students in the country, has very poor Spanish-surnamed representation (0.9%). The greatest number of Chicano law students are in California and Texas, which between the two, account for 50.6% of all Spanish-surnamed law

Table 39

Law School Enrollment - Full-Time, 1970
State Summaries

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Alabama	1	.1	.7	9	1.2	26.7	763	98.8	73.3	772	100.0
Arizona	31	3.7	6.3	49	5.9	15.1	788	94.1	84.9	837	100.0
Arkansas	3	.7	.2	21	4.8	18.7	414	95.2	81.3	435	100.0
California	224	3.7	15.5	591	9.7	25.6	5,524	90.3	74.4	6,115	100.0
Colorado	2	.4	13.0	12	2.7	16.9	437	97.3	83.1	449	100.0
Connecticut	7	.9	.2	111	14.1	6.6	678	85.9	93.4	789	100.0
D.C.	14	.4	2.1	488	15.2	73.9	2,716	84.8	26.1	3,204	100.0
Florida	60	3.0	6.6	82	4.1	22.2	1,913	95.9	77.8	1,995	100.0
Georgia	3	.3	.6	28	2.7	26.7	1,002	97.3	73.3	1,030	100.0
Idaho	1	.7	2.4	2	1.3	4.0	150	98.7	96.0	152	100.0
Illinois	23	.6	3.3	219	5.7	16.6	3,609	94.3	83.4	3,828	100.0
Indiana	7	.7	2.3	56	5.4	9.3	990	94.6	90.7	1,046	100.0
Iowa				18	2.5	2.0	710	97.5	98.0	728	100.0
Kansas	11	1.5	2.1	32	4.5	7.5	678	95.5	92.5	710	100.0
Kentucky				25	2.6	7.8	933	97.4	92.2	958	100.0
Louisiana	12	.9	1.9	85	6.4	31.9	1,250	93.6	68.1	1,335	100.0
Maine				2	1.2	1.0	159	98.8	99.0	161	100.0
Maryland	1	.5	.4	7	3.3	19.7	207	96.7	80.3	214	100.0
Mass.	36	.6	1.1	255	4.5	4.6	5,373	95.5	95.4	5,628	100.0
Michigan	7	.3	1.5	155	6.3	13.1	2,309	93.7	86.4	2,464	100.0
Minnesota	3	.3	.6	28	2.4	2.3	1,155	97.6	97.7	1,183	100.0
Missouri	14	1.4	.9	39	3.8	11.5	980	96.2	88.5	1,019	100.0

Table 39

Law School Enrollment - Full-Time, 1970 (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Montana				5	2.8	5.4	171	97.2	94.6	176	100.0
Nebraska	1	.2	1.4	6	.9	4.7	652	99.1	95.3	658	100.0
New Jersey	1	.1	1.9	113	12.7	13.0	780	87.3	87.0	893	100.0
New Mexico	21	9.6	40.1	32	14.6	49.4	187	85.4	50.6	219	100.0
New York	63	.9	4.9	284	4.0	17.6	6,877	96.0	82.4	7,161	100.0
N. Carolina	2	.2	.4	105	10.6	23.6	888	89.4	76.4	993	100.0
N. Dakota				2	1.4	3.1	146	98.6	96.9	148	100.0
Ohio	4	.1	1.3	154	4.8	11.4	3,053	95.2	89.4	3,207	100.0
Oklahoma	3	.4	1.4	22	2.6	12.0	832	97.4	88.0	854	100.0
Oregon	1	.1	1.7	18	2.2	4.2	789	97.8	95.8	807	100.0
Pennsylvania	9	.3	.4	123	3.9	9.3	3,000	96.1	90.7	3,123	100.0
S. Carolina	1	.2	.4	5	.8	31.9	646	99.2	68.9	651	100.0
S. Dakota				1	.5	5.6	183	99.5	94.4	184	100.0
Tennessee				17	1.7	16.4	1,006	98.3	83.6	1,023	100.0
Texas	133	3.4	18.4	311	9.3	31.2	3,047	90.7	68.8	3,358	100.0
Utah				7	1.8	6.3	382	98.2	93.7	389	100.0
Virginia				29	1.8	20.0	1,546	98.2	80.0	1,575	100.0
Washington	2	.3	2.1	35	5.6	6.4	596	94.4	93.4	621	100.0
Wisconsin	5	.5	.9	26	2.4	4.4	1,041	97.6	95.6	1,067	100.0
U.S. SUMMARY TOTALS	706	1.1		3,629	5.8		58,560	94.2		62,189	

Source: Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pg. 205.

school enrollment. The rank order of these states in Spanish-surnamed representation is as follows (See Table 40).

Table 40

Rank Order Of Spanish-surnamed Law School Enrollment By Number And Percentage Of Law School Enrollment By State, 1970

Number of Spanish-surnamed Enrolled	Percentage Enrollment
California	New Mexico
Texas	California
New York	Arizona
Florida	Texas
Arizona	Florida
New Mexico	New York
Colorado	Colorado

Brief Case Studies of Select Institutions

This section provides a brief glance at undergraduate and graduate enrollments in a limited number of educational institutions

Table 37

Dental School Enrollment - Full-Time, 1970

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
S. Carolina				1	.9	3.9	115	99.1	68.9	116	100.0
Tennessee	1	2.0		121	20.7	16.4	463	79.3	83.6	584	100.0
Texas	10	2.2	18.4	16	3.6	31.2	430	96.4	68.8	446	100.0
Virginia	1	.3		6	1.7	20.0	337	98.3	80.0	343	100.0
Washington	1	.3	2.1	12	3.2	6.4	368	96.8	95.4	380	100.0
Wisconsin	1	.2	.9	5	1.1	4.4	454	98.9	95.6	459	100.0
U.S. SUMMARY TOTALS	100	0.7		929	6.2		14,053	93.8		14,982	

Source: Urban Education Inc., Office for Civil Rights data, pg. 202.

in California and Texas. Because the available data is not uniform, the discussion varies in focus and range.

The University of California System. Table 41 shows Chicano enrollments from 1968 through 1973 for both undergraduates and graduates. The source is the University Ethnic Survey, the data of which is acquired through voluntary self-identification cards that are part of the registration packet which a student completes at the beginning of each academic period. The institutional data presented here covers the years 1968 to 1973, thus allowing comparisons over a period of time. The percentage of the total student body responding to the survey was approximately 85% in 1968-1970, 84% in 1971, 93% in 1972, and 95% in 1973.

As is the case with all the data presented in this report, there is good reason to have reservations about its accuracy. If for no other reason in this case, no distinctions were made between "Mexican" and "Spanish American" in the ethnic identification category which would identify Chicanos. Moreover,

Table 41

University of California Survey 1968-1973

Campus	Responses to Survey						Mexican or Spanish American (%)*					
	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Berkeley												
Undergrad.	16,844	18,116	18,322	11,159	17,722	20,891	1.3	2.5	2.3	2.8	3.0	3.3
Grad.	9,101	9,972	9,703	3,979	7,291	9,170	1.0	1.8	1.9	2.3	3.5	4.0
Total	25,985	28,088	28,525	15,138	25,013	30,061	1.2	2.2	2.2	2.7	3.1	3.5
Davis												
Undergrad.	8,697	9,263	9,979	9,910	11,121	11,415	1.0	2.2	1.7	2.2	2.5	2.6
Grad.	2,696	2,964	3,191	3,077	3,599	3,259	0.7	2.7	1.1	3.5	4.6	4.1
Total	11,393	12,227	13,170	12,987	14,720	14,674	0.9	2.3	1.6	2.5	3.0	2.9
Irvine												
Undergrad.	2,989	3,334	5,054	5,272	5,764	6,609	0.9	2.5	2.6	4.3	5.2	5.6
Grad.	910	933	1,008	900	1,150	1,284	0.8	1.8	1.4	2.9	5.0	6.4
Total	3,899	4,267	6,062	6,172	6,914	7,893	0.9	2.4	2.4	4.1	5.2	5.7
Los Angeles												
Undergrad.	18,722	19,542	18,009	17,090	18,438	19,858	3.2	4.6	4.8	5.7	6.3	6.1
Grad.	9,717	10,338	10,115	9,243	9,399	9,653	1.5	3.0	4.0	5.6	6.1	6.3
Total	28,439	29,880	28,124	26,333	27,837	29,511	2.6	2.0	4.5	5.7	6.3	6.2
Riverside												
Undergrad.	3,419	3,893	4,673	4,815	4,305	4,023	2.2	4.2	4.2	5.9	6.6	8.0
Grad.	1,155	1,293	1,318	1,272	1,199	1,280	1.3	4.3	3.8	5.4	5.7	6.2
Total	4,574	5,186	5,991	6,087	5,504	5,303	1.9	4.2	4.1	5.8	6.4	7.5
San Diego												
Undergrad.	2,665	2,939	4,310	4,494	4,983	5,389	1.3	2.9	4.5	6.6	6.9	7.1
Grad.	1,089	1,008	1,339	1,221	1,230	1,301	0.8	2.0	2.8	4.1	4.1	5.2
Total	3,754	3,947	5,649	5,715	6,213	6,690	1.2	2.6	4.1	6.1	6.3	6.8

University of California Survey 1968-1973 (continued)

Campus	Responses to Survey						Mexican or Spanish American (%)*					
	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
San Francisco												
Undergrad.	361	349	379	392	393	401	0.8	2.0	1.3	1.9	3.9	5.6
Grad.	1,536	1,487	1,606	643	1,724	1,713	0.5	2.4	3.7	4.4	5.7	5.8
Total	1,897	1,836	1,985	2,035	2,117	2,114	0.6	2.3	2.9	3.8	5.3	5.7
Santa Barbara												
Undergrad.	10,581	9,579	11,798	1,052	10,393	10,624	1.2	2.3	3.2	3.7	3.9	5.5
Grad.	1,738	1,662	1,846	1,552	1,591	1,982	0.8	1.4	3.3	3.1	4.7	5.5
Total	12,319	11,241	13,644	12,604	11,984	12,606	1.1	2.2	3.2	3.6	4.0	5.5
Santa Cruz												
Undergrad.	2,539	2,843	3,495	4,068	4,424	4,717	1.2	3.4	3.2	5.2	6.5	6.4
Grad.	99	148	277	310	268	292	0.0	1.4	1.4	4.6	4.9	4.8
Total	2,638	2,991	3,772	4,378	4,692	5,009	1.1	3.3	3.1	5.1	6.4	6.2
All Campuses												
Undergrad.	66,857	69,858	76,519	68,252	77,543	83,927	1.8	3.1	3.3	4.4	4.7	5.0
Grad.	28,041	29,805	30,403	23,197	27,451	29,934	1.1	2.4	2.8	4.4	5.0	5.2
Total	94,898	99,663	106,922	91,449	104,994	113,861	1.6	2.9	3.1	4.4	4.8	5.1

Source: University of California, Office of Vice-President--Planning, Office of Analytical Studies, Ethnic Surveys.

*Ratio of number of ethnic enrollments divided by survey responses minus "Decline to State."

surveys conducted by the Educational Opportunities Program of the University of California and by the President's Task Force on Chicanos and the University of California show a much lower Chicano representation for 1973-74 than should be the case if the data presented in Table 41 were to be correct. Nonetheless, the data does provide useful information and does reveal evident patterns. Specifically, the available information reveals that in 1973 only approximately 5% of total University of California student enrollment was Chicano. This percentage indicates that Chicano enrollment is far below what could be considered a reasonable level of representation, given that Chicanos constitute between 17 and 19% of the total population of the State of California

Chicano undergraduate enrollment in the University of California System, which was so low as to be nonexistent in some cases in 1968, grew substantially between 1968 and 1973. Major growth, according to the figures in Table 41, took place between 1968 and 1969. With the exception of the San Diego

campus, the growth rate between 1969 and 1970 is less dramatic. Some campuses in fact--Berkeley, Davis, and San Francisco--experienced sharp declines. Subsequent growth patterns are more uneven. With the exception of Davis, the smaller campuses of the University of California System--Irvine, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, San Francisco and Riverside--experienced higher growth rates in 1971 and 1972 than Berkeley. University of California, Los Angeles, on the other hand, is surpassed in growth only by Riverside, San Diego, and the Santa Cruz campuses. The highest percentage of Chicano undergraduate enrollment in 1972, for example, was at San Diego (6.9%) with Riverside (6.6%), Santa Cruz (6.5%), and UCLA (6.3%) close behind, in that order. The lowest percentages were recorded at Davis (2.5%) and Berkeley (3.0%). The growth rate, however, began to level off somewhat by 1973, although Riverside and Santa Barbara continued to steadily gain Chicano enrollment. As of 1973, Riverside campus had the highest percentage (8%) of Chicano undergraduate enrollment of any campus of the University of California System,

followed by San Diego (97.1%), Santa Cruz (6.4%), and UCLA (6.1%). In absolute numbers, however, UCLA is first, with Berkeley a distant second. The remaining campuses have approximately the same absolute numbers of Chicanos (between 300 and 400), with the exception of San Francisco, which has approximately 500 total undergraduates.

Between 1968 and 1973 the percentage of Chicano undergraduate enrollment in the University of California System grew from 1.8% to 5.0%. The general rate of growth was initially high and then tapered off. Only Riverside and Santa Barbara campuses continued to experience substantial growth. San Francisco campus reveals continued growth through 1973, but the numbers are so small as to be insignificant. Two campuses--UCLA and Santa Cruz--show a drop in Chicano enrollment between 1972 and 1973. The remaining campuses--Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, and San Diego--show less than 1/2 of 1% growth in Chicano enrollments between those two years.

The reasons for varying growth patterns

from campus to campus, although both interesting and significant, are not the subject of this section. Complex geographical, demographic, social, economic, political, and historical factors come into play in all of them, with the contradictory result that two of the most elite and most popular of the University of California campuses--San Diego and Santa Cruz--and two of the least elite and least popular--Riverside and Santa Barbara--experience the highest growth rates. The leading center, however, continues to be the Los Angeles campus, where vigorous Chicano leadership has surmounted the multitude of negative factors which had historically limited Chicano undergraduate enrollment there.

It is reasonable to assume, given these patterns and the decline in financial aid over the past three years, that Chicano undergraduate enrollment at the University of California has peaked and is currently declining. This assumption is confirmed by the other University of California studies referred to earlier, which indicate that in 1973-74 there were fewer Chicanos enrolled

in the University of California System than the data on Table 41 indicates.

Graduate Chicano enrollment in the University of California System, according to the data in Table 41, also grew substantially between 1968 and 1973, from 1.6% to 5.1%. If the growth percentage was impressive, it was because prior to 1968 the number of Chicanos in the Graduate Division of the University of California System was negligible. Berkeley recorded less than 100 in 1968; UCLA slightly over 100; the rest of the campuses together, less than 100. Even allowing for those students who were not identified, the numbers are still pitifully small.

Chicano graduate enrollment in the University of California System at large grew from 1.1% to 5.1% between 1968 and 1973, or 1/10th of a percentage point over the Chicano undergraduate enrollment growth. The percentage of Chicano graduate enrollment to total graduate enrollment is higher than undergraduate Chicano enrollment to total undergraduate enrollment at both of the

major University of California graduate centers: Berkeley and UCLA. At Berkeley the comparative figures are 3.3% undergraduate and 4% graduate. At UCLA they are 6.1% undergraduate and 6.3% graduate. Although the Chicano growth rates at the smaller campuses are large they represent miniscule numbers. UCLA alone has more Chicano graduate students than all the smaller campuses combined.

Graduate enrollment in the University of California System also begins to show signs of peaking and the beginning of a decrease by 1973. Where between 1971 and 1972 Berkeley increased its Chicano graduate population by 1.2%, between 1972 and 1973 the growth rate dropped to .5%. UCLA also shows a drop from a .5% growth rate in 1972 to .2% in 1973. Of the remaining campuses only Irvine, Riverside and San Diego increased their growth rate. Two campuses, Davis and Santa Cruz, actually dropped in Chicano graduate enrollment between 1972 and 1973. Numerous departments in the University of California System do not report any Chicanos

in either the 1974-75 class or in the 1975-76 class, which creates considerable and very real cause for concern.

A study made by the Graduate Studies office at Berkeley confirms the pattern of decreasing Chicano enrollment with respect to the Arts and Sciences. The growth experienced at Berkeley between 1968 and 1973 at the graduate level was in the professional areas. Table 42 shows the distribution of Chicano graduate students at Berkeley with respect to degree goal. The overwhelming majority, fully 60%, are pursuing one or another professional degrees. Those numbers are still increasing, as is revealed in Table 43, which shows the distribution of Chicanos at Berkeley by field of study for both 1973 and 1974. The Arts and Sciences enrollments either held steady or decreased between 1973 and 1974. The sole exceptions, Mathematics and Statistics, recorded an increase in the numbers of students from 3 to 7. The 1974-75 Arts and Sciences class thus either does not include any new Chicanos or new admissions are not

keeping pace with attrition and completion rates.

For a variety of reasons, the status of Chicanos at the University of California is a critical index of the status of Chicanos in higher education in general. First of all, the large Chicano population in California provides a large pool from which the Universities draw on. Second, the nature of the system, the fact that there is a variety of campuses in a variety of areas and with a variety of focuses make the University of California System very attractive to both in-state and out-of-state Chicanos. Third, the University of California is a public system, which makes it a less expensive and--in theory, at least--a less exclusive institution than comparable first rank universities Fourth, the University of California was one of the first systems to feel the pressures of Chicano demands for access, and was also one of the first to respond to those pressures. Finally, the University of California, although highly elitest, did also include in its administration and faculty large numbers

Table 42

Chicanos At University Of California At
Berkeley By Degree Goal, 1974
As Percentage Of Chicano Graduate Enrollment

Ph.D.	31.9%
Law	26.4%
Masters or Teaching Credential	38.0%
No Information	3.6%

Table 43

Chicanos At University Of California At
Berkeley By Field Of Study 1973, 1974

	1973		1974	
	Number	%	Number	%
Agricultural, Biological and Health Sciences	25	10	23	8
Humanities	24	9	24	9
Math. and Statistics	3	1	7	3
Physical Sciences	14	6	10	4
Professional	146	58	172	62
Social Sciences	40	16	40	14
Total	252	100	276	100

of sympathetic and responsive individuals. Given these factors, Chicano enrollment should not only be higher but should still be increasing. That it apparently is not is very troubling.

The California State University and College System. The data used for this section is also based on voluntary ethnic identification cards. In this case, however, the data is not uniform. There are several sources and these vary from year to year in format and manner of reporting. Once again the qualification is made that although the accuracy of the numbers may not be absolute, the patterns that emerge are valid indicators of the status of Chicanos in this system.

By way of explanation it should be added that the California State University and College System (CSUC) is the second level of a three level higher education system in California. The first level, the California Community College System, is open to any student who has completed high school. The second level, the California State University and College System, is open to high school

students who graduate with a GPA of C or better and to graduates of the Community College System. The University of California System is limited to those students who rank in the top 12% of their high school graduating classes and to academically superior transfers from both the Community College and State University and College Systems. Although the California State University and College System has graduate programs in most fields, only the University of California System grants the doctorate or has law and medical schools.

Table 44 shows the enrollment for three different years. The 1967 data and the 1970 data are for full-time students only. The 1972 data is for both full- and part-time students, but includes all Spanish-surnamed students, whether Chicano or not. The 1973 data is calculated from a 73.1% response to the ethnic survey. The percentage response for prior years is not available.

Despite some clear advantages (lower tuition and fees, greater accessibility, wider variety of locations, larger variety

Table 44

Chicanos In California State University And Colleges

	1967	1970	1972	1973
Undergraduate	--	5.4	6.1	5.8
Graduate	--	3.0	3.4	3.6
Total	2.9	5.1	5.5	5.3

Sources: 1967 and 1970 data from López, Ronald W. and Darryl D. Enos, Chicanos in Public Higher Education in California, Joint Committee on Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1972. 1972 data taken from CSUC Directors of Institutional Research, "Enrollment by Ethnic Group, Fall 1972."

of professional programs, less demanding standards, the CSUC System does not compare very favorably with the University of California System although it fares better than some of the individual campuses such as Davis and Berkeley.

Although the sources do not show the differences between graduate and undergraduate

enrollment for 1967 and while the 2.9% total given for 1967 may be underestimated, nonetheless comparative figures reveal a substantial increase in both the graduate and undergraduate student population between 1967 and 1970. Between 1970 and 1972, however, the undergraduate population grew by only .7% and the graduate by only .4%. By way of contrast, the University of California System growth figures were 1.4% and 2.2% respectively. The 1973 figures reveal a decrease of .3% in the CSUC System undergraduate enrollment versus a .3% in the University of California System undergraduate enrollment. These comparative statistics are cause for concern. Not only do they suggest that post-1972 University of California System Chicano enrollment growth has been at the expense of the CSUC System growth, but in addition they support the conclusion that Chicano undergraduate enrollment has peaked in California and may well be decreasing.

At the graduate level, and it should be emphasized once more that the CSUC System

is restricted to the first post-baccalaureate degree, the data reveals a less favorable comparison. The available information reveals a graduate student population of 3.0% in 1970, which grows to 3.6% in 1973. The University of California System, which records a 2.8% graduate student enrollment in 1970, grows to 5.2% by 1973. Although there are a number of factors which might serve to explain this gap--prestige, support funds, greater range of offerings--there is reason to wonder why the CSUC System has not been able to capitalize on its various advamtages.

Table 45 shows the distribution by field of study for the 11,218 Chicanos who responded to the 1973 survey. The same information, unfortunately, is not available for the University of California System and thus it is not possible to make useful comparisons. The undergraduate ranks in the professional areas are dominated by Business and Management (12.3%) leading Education (9.2%) by a wide margin. The next largest category is that of the Social Sciences (26%), when this category is expanded to

include those students categorized under Psychology, Area Studies, and Interdisciplinary Studies. The Fine and Applied Arts, combined with Letters and Foreign Languages, which equating the Arts and Humanities category, rank behind the Social Sciences with 13.5%. The Natural Sciences rank last, with approximately 8% of the total enrollment. There is, however, a large group--approximately 14%--which is undeclared.

The distribution by field of study changes somewhat at the graduate level. Education becomes the principal area of concentration, with 23% of the total number of students who have declared their degree and area of study intentions. Because the 26% in the undeclared category includes persons who are pursuing a teaching certificate program, Education is clearly the preponderant field of study of Chicano graduate students in the CSUC System. The remaining professional areas account for 18% of the total Chicano graduate student enrollment followed by the Social Sciences with 16%, the Arts

Table 45

Field Of Study Distribution For Chicanos In California State University And Colleges, 1973

Field of Study	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Agriculture and Natural Resources	132	1.4	2	0.1	134	1.2
Architecture and Environmental Design	84	0.9	15	0.9	99	0.9
Area Studies*	38	0.4	11	0.7	49	0.4
Biological Sciences	415	4.3	24	1.5	489	4.4
Business and Management	1,180	12.3	65	4.0	1,245	11.1
Communications	134	1.4	7	0.4	141	1.2
Computer and Information Sciences	42	0.4	3	0.2	45	0.4
Education	882	9.2	379	23.4	1,261	11.2
Engineering	327	3.4	32	2.0	359	3.2
Fine and Applied Arts	479	5.0	50	3.1	529	4.7
Foreign Languages	525	5.5	102	6.3	627	5.6
Health Professions	331	3.4	38	2.4	369	3.3
Home Economics	100	1.0	12	0.7	112	1.0
Letters	286	3.0	64	4.0	350	3.1
Library Science	--	--	8	0.5	8	0.1
Mathematics	115	1.2	13	0.8	128	1.1
Physical Sciences	72	0.7	8	0.5	80	0.7
Psychology	405	4.2	43	2.7	448	4.0
Public Affairs and Services	681	7.1	111	6.9	792	7.1
Social Sciences**	1,831	19.1	207	12.8	2,038	18.2
Interdisciplinary Studies	214	2.2	2	0.1	216	1.9
Undeclared	1,329	13.8	420	26.0	1,749	15.6
Total	9,602	100.0	1,616	100.0	11,218	100.0

Source: California State University and Colleges, "Fall 1973 Student Enrollment by Sex and Ethnicity," prepared by Division of Student Affairs and Division of Institutional Research, 1974.

*Asian Studies, Indian Studies, Latin American Studies, East Asian Studies, Russian Area Studies, European Studies.

**Chicano Studies are included in this category.

and Humanities with 14%, and the Natural Sciences and Mathematics with less than 3%.

Stanford University. The final case study, that of Stanford University, also has severe limitations in that undergraduate enrollment was unfortunately not available for this report. Despite the limitations of the information, Stanford University is an important case to examine because it is a private and prestigious university which is very popular with Chicano students. The following discussion is based on data available for Chicano graduate enrollment at Stanford University. The information presented in Tables 46 and 47 is taken from a report prepared by a committee chaired by Maria Baeza-Smith and Thomas Rhue, both of whom were Assistants to the Dean of Graduate Studies at the time of the preparation of the report in 1974.

Chicano graduate enrollment, which was negligible (a total of 20) in 1968, grew to 202 by 1973. This impressive increase should, however, be examined in another context. In 1973 the Chicano graduate student

Table 46

Chicano Graduate Enrollment At Stanford University

School	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Business	—	1	9	17	20	24
Earth Sciences	—	—	—	1	1	1
Education	6	13	12	22	37	51
Engineering	3	—	2	9	20	15
Humanities and Sciences	5	7	16	33	43	49
Law	4	6	7	12	22	36
Medicine	2	5	10	14	21	26
Total	20	32	56	108	164	202

Table 47

Chicanos As Percentage Of Total Graduate Enrollment At Stanford, 1973

School	Percentage Chicanos
Business	3.7
Earth Sciences	0.7
Education	10.2
Engineering	1.2
Humanities and Sciences	3.8
Law	7.9
Medicine	5.7
Total	4.2

population constituted less than half of the total minority graduate population (202 out of 465, or 43%). The total minority graduate population accounted for 9.6% of the total Stanford graduate student population. Chicanos thus constituted approximately 4.2% of the total Stanford graduate population.

The majority of these graduate students were pursuing professional degrees, in Law (18%), Medicine (13%), Business (12.5%), or Engineering (7.5%). The largest single group, however, was pursuing an advanced degree in Education (25%). The remaining 25% were in the Arts and Sciences.

The University of Texas, Austin. Although Chicano enrollment statistics at the University of Texas, Austin are available only for 1974, they are provided here in order to demonstrate the similarity of enrollment patterns despite differing geographic and socioeconomic contexts. Besides the time limitations, this information also has the reliability problems of the previous data. In this particular case the numbers included "Spanish-surnamed" students who may or may

not be Chicano.

The total enrollment at the University of Texas, Austin in 1974 was 40,917 students, of which approximately 90% were undergraduate and 10% graduate. Less than 2,200, or approximately 5.4% of the total, were Chicanos. Out of a total population of approximately 12 million Texans however, Chicanos number 2.5 million; that is, over 20% of the total population.

Of the 2,200 Chicanos at the University, approximately 1,900 (04.85% of the total Chicano enrollment) were undergraduates. Of those 1,900, slightly over 50% were enrolled in one or another professional fields. The largest number was registered in the School of Business Administration (238) and the largest proportion was recorded by the School of Business Administration (14.7%). In the Arts and Sciences the largest enrollments were in the Natural Sciences and in the Social and Behavioral Sciences. Together these fields accounted for 30% of the total Chicano enrollment at the University of Texas. Education and Business

Administration accounted for another 20%.

At the University of Texas, Chicanos accounted for less than 4% of the total Graduate School enrollment, less than 2% of the total Graduate School of Business Administration, and only 4.1% of the total Law School enrollment in 1974. Their total numbers were less than 300, or approximately 15% of the total Chicano population.

Two-thirds of the Chicanos engaged in graduate work at the University of Texas in 1974 were enrolled in a professional field. Education and Law accounted for over half of all graduate enrollees. The large undergraduate enrollments recorded in the Natural, Social and Behavioral Sciences were not reflected in the Graduate School. The Social and Behavioral Sciences, for example, recorded only 22 Chicano graduate students, as opposed to 315 undergraduates. The Natural Sciences recorded only 7, as compared with 358 undergraduates.

Since the University of Texas figures are not available for other years and since

figures are not available for field distribution for the University of California System, no meaningful comparisons can be made. Two items stand out, however, and should be insisted on again. First, the numbers of Chicanos enrolled in the University of Texas is decidedly out of proportion to their numbers in the population at large. Second, despite surprising concentrations of Chicano undergraduate numbers in the Natural, Social and Behavioral Sciences, very few are reported at the graduate level.

Table 48

Chicano Enrollment University Of Texas, Austin
By School Or College, 1974

School or College	Number	% of Total	% of Chicanos
Humanities	70	4.0	3.2
Communications	108	4.0	4.9
Social and Behavioral Sciences	315	6.2	14.3
Natural Sciences	358	5.8	16.3
Nursing	41	4.6	1.9
General and Comparative Studies	64	5.0	2.9
Business Administration	238	3.7	10.8
Education	195	6.4	8.9
Engineering	131	5.3	6.0
Fine Arts	77	3.9	3.5
Pharmacy	146	14.7	6.6
Architecture	54	9.0	2.4
Graduate School	222	3.8	10.1
Graduate School of Business	11	1.4	0.5
Graduate School of Nursing	0	0	0
Law	67	4.1	3.0
No Information	101	--	4.6
Total	2,198		100.0

Table 49

Spanish-surname Enrollment In Graduate School, University Of Texas, Austin 1974

Field of Study	Number	% of Spanish-surname
Humanities	21	7.3
Communications	12	4.2
Social and Behavioral Sciences	22	7.6
Natural Sciences	7	2.4
Mathematics	1	0.3
General and Comparative Studies	6	2.1
Business Administration	2	0.7
Education	99	34.2
Engineering	18	6.2
Fine Arts	4	1.4
Pharmacy	3	1.0
Architecture	1	0.3
Social Work	16	5.5
Computer Science	3	1.0
Library Science	8	2.8
Law	66	22.8
Total	289	100.0

Summary

By comparison, at the University of Texas, 22% of the Chicano graduate student population was in Law, 22% was in the Arts and Sciences, 12% was in professional fields, and 34% were in Education. The University of California, Berkeley statistics show a similar pattern, with 58% of Chicano graduates in the professional areas (including Education), 16% in the Social Sciences, 17% in the various sciences and mathematics fields, and 9% in the Humanities. Several general conclusions can be made from the enrollment patterns demonstrated by the data from the University of California System, University of Texas and Stanford. The trend towards the professional fields appears to be consistent with national enrollment statistics. There is a clear preference on the part of Chicanos for the study of Law, Medicine, Education and other professional areas. To illustrate this point, at the University of Texas, 22.8% of the Chicano graduate student population was in Law, at the University of Berkeley, 26.4% and 7.9% at Stanford.

1.15f cyptld photo

Conclusion

In the past ten years major changes have taken place with respect to Chicano participation in higher education. Where once the Chicano presence in institutions of higher learning was limited to small numbers of maids, janitors and gardeners, even smaller numbers of students, and miniscule numbers of graduate students and faculty, today Chicanos are visibly present in most Western colleges and universities not only as employees but also as students. During this period supportive and educational programs have been developed in many universities to address the needs and interests of Chicano students. Chicano faculty now hold appointments in ethnic studies programs and in traditional departments. Here and there Chicanos can be found occupyiny positions of responsibility in college and university administration. Although Chicanos have experienced major gains in higher education in the form of increased enrollments, development of Chicano-oriented programs, and faculty-staff appointments, these gains are

significant principally because previously there was little or no representation of Chicanos in institutions of higher learning. Comparative statistics reveal that Chicanos still do not have representation in higher education which corresponds to their proportion of the general population. The information available indicates furthermore that the Chicano enrollment rate in undergraduate institutions has already leveled off and may already be declining. The implications of such a decrease are serious. Smaller enrollments will be used by university administrations to justify further cutbacks in Chicano-oriented programs, will result in a reduction in the number of Chicanos who will finish the Bachelor's degree program and move into post-baccalaureate degree programs, and will bring about a decrease in the number of Chicanos who will enter doctoral programs and pursue a career in higher education.

Although to some extent the leveling off of Chicano enrollments may reflect the disillusionment with higher education currently

present in American society, the primary reason for the decline in the rate of Chicano enrollments is an economic one. Since the Chicano population is primarily a low income population it has suffered the effects of unemployment and inflation more grievously than the majority population. The change in educational financial aid packages from outright grants to combinations of loans and grants to predominantly or exclusively loan packages have seriously affected the educational plans and aspirations of many Chicano students.

At the graduate level the state of the economy, the level of indebtedness of Chicano students at the end of the Bachelor's degree program, and the increasing unavailability of scholarship and fellowship monies are beginning to affect Chicano enrollments. To cite but one example of the latter, the Ford Foundation Graduate Fellowships Program, which has supported graduate study leading toward a career in higher education for approximately 400 Chicanos since 1968, will make its final initial awards this year

(1975-76). To these very concrete conditions must be added the very serious problems posed by signs of reduced access to post-baccalaureate educational institutions and, for those interested in a career in higher education, very real fears about employment possibilities.

While in the past decade the number of Chicanos occupying faculty and staff positions in institutions of higher learning have grown, this increase is currently in jeopardy. The cutbacks in Chicano-oriented programs will reduce the number of current appointments. Furthermore, the resistance of institutions to the development of new programs together with the increasingly reduced number of available positions in traditional programs and departments may mean that we will soon reach a peak in Chicano faculty-staff appointments and that those numbers will thereafter decline.

The future of Chicanos in higher education is, as a consequence, less bright today than it was at the beginning of this decade. Not only must Chicanos fight to preserve

present gains, to say nothing about making further ones, but they must also do it under less favorable conditions than have been present in the past 10 years. A faltering economy, an antagonistic society, and an unsympathetic and sometimes hostile academe present major obstacles to Chicano aspirations. It has become clear in recent years that the tactics and strategies of the past may not serve Chicanos well in the future and that the structures which were developed in the past may be inadequate for the struggles which face Chicanos today. However bleak the future may seem, nonetheless Chicanos today have a greater interest, a more substantial presence, and a higher level of participation in higher education than ever before. The knowledge, experience, and expertise Chicanos have gained in the last ten years, together with the interest, presence and participation which has been generated over that period, should be used in the struggle for continued access, funding, and appointments and for continuing improvement in the quality of education for Chicanos.

Appendixes

A. Table 50 - Full-Time Graduate School Enrollment 1972 - State Summaries

B. Table 51 - Full-Time Professional School Enrollment 1972 - State Summaries

p. 162 cpt 6 plots 163

Appendix A
Table 50

Full-Time Graduate School Enrollment 1972
State Summaries

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Alabama	25	.5	.3	1,019	22.7	26.7	3,468	77.3	73.3	4,487	100.0
Arizona	131	1.9	6.3	333	4.9	15.1	6,510	95.1	84.9	6,843	100.0
Arkansas	5	.2	.2	140	5.9	18.7	2,214	94.1	81.3	2,354	100.0
California	1,753	3.3	15.5	6,508	12.4	25.6	45,836	87.6	74.4	52,344	100.0
Colorado	147	2.6	13.0	443	7.9	16.9	5,196	92.1	83.1	5,639	100.0
Connecticut	54	1.0	.2	370	7.0	6.6	4,906	93.0	93.4	5,276	100.0
Delaware	0	0	1.1	12	1.5	15.8	813	98.5	84.2	825	100.0
D.C.	110	1.5	2.1	1,622	23.2	73.9	5,359	76.8	26.1	6,981	100.0
Florida	131	1.6	6.6	849	10.9	22.2	6,946	89.1	77.8	7,789	100.0
Georgia	41	.3	.6	1,612	15.4	26.7	8,855	84.6	73.8	10,457	100.0
Idaho	2	.5	2.4	20	5.1	4.0	376	94.9	96.0	396	100.0
Illinois	186	.8	9.3	1,967	8.6	16.6	20,976	91.4	83.4	22,943	100.0
Indiana	65	.5	2.3	637	5.5	9.3	10,976	94.5	90.7	11,613	100.0
Iowa	25	.4	.6	177	3.3	2.0	5,199	96.7	98.0	5,376	100.0
Kansas	49	1.0	2.1	372	8.0	7.5	4,283	92.0	92.5	4,655	100.0
Kentucky	11	.5	.4	212	10.2	7.8	1,866	89.8	92.2	2,078	100.0
Louisiana	38	.6	1.9	584	10.4	31.9	5,045	89.6	68.1	5,629	100.0
Maine	0	0	.4	2	.5	1.0	411	99.5	99.0	413	100.0
Maryland	151	.9	1.4	1,134	7.4	19.7	14,102	92.6	80.3	15,236	100.0
Mass.	160	.8	1.1	1,114	5.8	4.6	18,054	94.2	95.4	19,168	100.0
Michigan	144	.8	1.5	1,540	8.6	13.1	16,278	91.4	86.9	17,818	100.0

Table 50

Full-Time Graduate School 1972 (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in States	Total	%
Minnesota	53	.5	.6	495	5.2	2.3	9,095	94.8	97.7	9,590	100.0
Mississippi	16	.6	.4	420	16.3	37.6	2,149	83.7	62.4	2,569	100.0
Missouri	45	.5	.9	460	5.9	11.5	7,340	94.1	88.5	7,800	100.0
Montana	2	.1	1.1	23	2.1	5.4	1,072	97.9	94.6	1,095	100.0
Nebraska	7	.3	1.4	43	2.4	4.7	1,748	97.6	95.3	1,791	100.0
Nevada	5	.8	5.6	14	2.3	13.5	583	97.7	86.5	597	100.0
N. Hampshire	1	.1	.4	13	1.3	.9	980	98.7	99.1	993	100.0
New Jersey	65	1.1	1.9	730	13.1	13.0	4,841	86.9	87.0	5,571	100.0
New Mexico	250	10.1	40.1	328	13.4	49.4	2,128	86.6	50.6	2,456	100.0
New York	641	1.5	4.9	4,222	10.1	17.6	37,681	89.9	82.4	41,903	100.0
N. Carolina	64	.6	.4	1,121	11.4	23.6	8,671	88.6	76.4	9,792	100.0
N. Dakota	3	.2	.3	22	1.8	3.1	1,169	98.2	96.9	1,191	100.0
Ohio	85	.5	1.3	1,308	7.8	11.4	15,506	92.2	89.4	16,814	100.0
Oklahoma	59	.7	1.4	608	7.8	12.0	7,205	92.2	88.0	7,813	100.0
Oregon	54	1.1	1.7	362	7.6	4.2	4,428	92.4	95.8	4,790	100.0
Pennsylvania	91	.5	.4	1,236	7.2	9.3	15,886	92.8	90.7	17,122	100.0
Rhode Island	92	3.3	.7	220	8.1	4.4	2,488	91.8	95.6	2,078	100.0
S. Carolina	1	.0	.4	163	9.0	31.9	1,640	91.0	68.9	1,803	100.0
S. Dakota	2	.2	.4	18	2.6	5.6	665	97.4	94.4	683	100.0
Tennessee	10	.1		636	11.0	16.4	5,140	89.0	83.6	5,776	100.0
Texas	863	3.7	18.4	2,346	10.1	31.2	20,850	89.9	68.8	23,196	100.0
Utah	60	1.2	4.1	223	4.8	6.3	4,397	95.2	93.7	4,620	100.0

Table 50

Full-Time Graduate School 1972 (continued)

	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Vermont	7	.5	.6	54	4.3	1.0	1,204	95.7	99.0	1,258	100.0
Virginia	11	.1	1.0	390	6.7	20.0	5,416	93.3	80.0	5,806	100.0
Washington	80	1.0	2.1	572	7.6	6.4	6,916	92.4	93.4	7,488	100.0
West Virginia	4	.1	.4	54	2.5	4.5	2,092	97.5	94.5	2,146	100.0
Wisconsin	104	1.0	.9	533	5.1	4.4	9,859	94.9	95.6	10,392	100.0

Source: Office for Civil Rights, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1972. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OCR-74-13, 1974, pp. 80-81.

Appendix B
Table 51

Full-Time Professional School Enrollment 1972
State Summaries

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Alabama	6	.3	.3	125	6.4	26.7	1,828	93.6	73.3	1,953	100.0
Arizona	61	4.6	6.3	96	7.4	15.1	1,202	92.6	84.9	1,298	100.0
Arkansas	0	.0	.2	33	3.4	18.7	950	96.6	81.3	983	100.0
California	784	4.7	15.5	3,009	18.2	25.6	13,520	81.2	74.4	16,529	100.0
Colorado	59	3.6	13.0	131	8.0	16.9	1,504	92.0	83.1	1,635	100.0
Connect	23	.8	.2	226	8.6	6.6	2,397	91.4	93.4	2,623	100.0
Delaw	0	0	1.1	199	20.0	15.8	798	80.0	84.2	997	100.0
D.C.	57	.8	2.1	1,183	18.1	73.9	5,340	81.9	26.1	6,523	100.0
Florida	68	1.7	6.6	177	4.6	22.2	3,697	95.4	77.8	3,874	100.0
Georgia	6	.1	.6	275	7.2	26.7	3,524	92.8	73.3	3,799	100.0
Idaho	1	.3	2.4	4	1.6	4.0	247	98.4	96.0	251	100.0
Illinois	90	.7	3.3	702	5.7	16.6	11,609	94.3	83.4	12,311	100.0
Indiana	19	.4	2.3	159	4.0	9.3	3,809	96.0	90.7	3,968	100.0
Iowa	13	.3	. .6	85	2.6	2.0	3,214	97.4	98.0	3,299	100.0
Kansas	14	.7	2.1	68	3.5	7.5	1,892	96.5	92.5	1,960	100.0
Kentucky	2	0	.4	98	2.8	7.8	3,441	97.2	92.2	3,539	100.0
Louisiana	42	.7	1.9	479	8.8	31.9	4,952	91.2	68.1	5,431	100.0
Maine	0	0	.4	3	1.5	1.0	195	98.5	99.0	198	100.0
Maryland	21	.7	1.4	190	7.2	19.7	2,437	92.8	80.3	2,627	100.0
Mass.	82	.9	1.1	646	7.7	4.6	7,746	92.3	95.4	8,392	100.0
Michigan	100	1.1	1.5	905	10.0	13.1	8,159	90.0	86.9	9,064	100.0

Table 51

Full-Time Professional School 1972 (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Minnesota	12	.3	.6	87	2.3	2.3	3,755	97.7	97.7	3,842	100.0
Mississippi	1	.0	.4	37	3.5	37.6	1,006	96.5	62.4	1,043	100.0
Missouri	54	.7	.9	312	4.3	11.5	6,898	95.7	88.5	7,210	100.0
Montana	0	0	1.1	3	1.6	5.4	183	98.4	94.6	186	100.0
Nebraska	11	.4	1.4	67	2.5	4.7	2,654	97.5	95.3	2,721	100.0
Nevada	0	0	5.6	0	0	13.5	0	0	86.5	0	100.0
N. Hampshire	2	1.2	.4	10	6.2	.9	152	93.8	99.1	162	100.0
New Jersey	38	1.3	1.9	295	10.4	13.0	2,532	89.6	87.0	2,827	100.0
New Mexico	80	15.6	40.1	114	22.3	49.4	398	77.7	50.6	512	100.0
New York	143	1.0	4.9	865	6.1	17.6	13,254	93.9	82.4	14,119	100.0
N. Carolina	2	0	.4	280	8.9	23.6	2,899	91.1	76.4	3,179	100.0
N. Dakota	0	0	.3	1	.3	3.1	295	99.7	96.9	296	100.0
Ohio	54	.6	1.3	397	4.9	11.4	17,746	95.1	89.4	8,143	100.0
Oklahoma	12	.5	1.4	68	3.2	12.0	2,060	96.8	88.0	2,128	100.0
Oregon	9	.4	1.7	68	3.2	4.2	2,081	96.8	95.8	2,149	100.0
Pennsylvania	37	.1	.4	539	4.4	9.3	11,783	95.6	90.7	12,322	100.0
Rhode Island	0	0	.7	0	0	4.4	0	0	95.6	0	100.0
S. Carolina	0	0	.4	36	2.0	31.9	1,737	98.0	68.9	1,773	100.0
S. Dakota	0	0	.4	5	1.4	5.6	350	98.6	94.4	355	100.0
Tennessee	10	.2	.4	611	13.7	16.4	3,853	86.3	83.6	4,464	100.0
Texas	593	6.6	18.4	976	11.0	31.2	7,932	89.0	68.8	8,908	100.0
Utah	14	1.8	4.1	33	4.4	6.3	716	95.6	93.7	749	100.0

Table 51

Full-Time Professional School 1972 (continued)

State	Spanish-surnamed	%	% in State	Total Minorities	%	% in State	Whites	%	% in State	Total	%
Vermont	0	.0	.6	1	.2	1.0	424	99.8	99.0	425	100.0
Virginia	0	.0	1.0	78	2.3	20.0	3,351	97.7	80.0	429	100.0
Washington	15	.7	2.1	159	7.7	6.4	1,919	92.3	93.4	2,078	100.0
West Virginia	2	.1	.4	15	1.1	4.5	1,366	98.9	94.5	1,381	100.0
Wisconsin	2	.9	.9	140	3.7	4.4	3,654	96.3	95.6	3,794	100.0

Source: Office for Civil Rights, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1972. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OCR-74-13, 1974, pp. 82-83.

Selected Bibliographies on Chicanos in Higher Education

by

Dr. Juan Gómez-Quiñones

Selected Reference Sources

Charles, Edgar B., Ed. Mexican American Education, a Bibliography. New Mexico State University, March 1968.

Chicano Studies Center. Guide to Chicano Studies Departments, Programs and Centers, Chicano Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, 1975.

Directorio Chicano. Directory of Chicano Alternative Schools. Hayward, California, Southwest Network, 1973.

ERIC/CRESS. Higher Education for Mexican Americans, A Selected Bibliography, Summer, 1975, ED 108818.

Gómez-Quiñones, Juan and Alberto Camarillo. Selected Bibliography for Chicano Studies, 3rd edition. Chicano Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, 1975.

Guerra, Manuel H., et al. "Listing of Resource Materials Concerned with the Spanish-speaking." Washington State Office of Public Instruction, Olympia, June 1971.

Heathman, James, and Cecilia J. Martíniz. Mexican American Education: A Selected Bibliography. Educational Research Information Center, Las Cruces, Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, New Mexico State University, 1969.

The National Directory of Chicano Faculty and Research. Aztlan Publications, Chicano Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles, 1974.

School of Education. Hispanic Heritage: An Annotated Bibliography. Denver, University of Colorado, June 1969.

Schramko, Linda Fowler, Comp. Chicano Bibliography; Selected Materials on Americans of Mexican Descent. Bibliographic Series No. 1, Revised Edition. California, Sacramento State College, 1970.

Periodicals

Aztlán, International Journal of Chicano Studies Research, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1970. Los Angeles, California, Publications Unit, Chicano Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90024.

This Journal's former subtitle was: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts.

The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingue, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1974. New York, Department of Romance Languages, City College of New York, N.Y. 10031.

A Journal dedicated to the study of the linguistics and literature of English-Spanish bilingualism in the U.S.

Chicano Law Review, Vol. 1, No. 1, Summer 1972. Los Angeles, California, Chicano Law Students, School of Law, University of California, Los Angeles 90024.

Subtitle: A Publication of the Chicano Law Students at UCLA School of Law.

El Grito, A Journal of Mexican American Thought, Vol. 1, No. 1, Fall 1967. Berkeley, California. Ceased.

El Grito del Sol, A Chicano Quarterly, Vol. 1, January-March 1976, 2150 Shattuck Avenue, Berkeley, California 94704.

El Mirlo Canta de Noticatlan: Carta Sobre Estudios Chicanos, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1974. Los Angeles, California. Publications Unit, Chicano Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90024.

El Ojo, Chicano Newsletter. Washington, D.C.

Encuentro Femenil, Vol. 1, Spring 1973. P.O. Box 735, San Fernando, California 92341.

Época, Vol. 1, 1971. Ceased.

This magazine was issued by Washington, D.C., National Council of Chicano Studies only once. The volume indicated on the cover of Vol. 1, No. 2, was an error.

Journal of Ethnic Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1973. Bellingham, Washington, College of Ethnic Studies, Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington 98225.

Latin American Perspectives, Vol. 1, Spring 1974. Riverside, California, P.O. Box 5703, Riverside, California 92507.

This quarterly has indicated a possible future issue devoted to the Chicano.

Mano a Mano, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1972.

Houston, Texas, Chicano Training Center, 3520 Montrose, Suite 216, Houston, Texas 77006.

Mester, Vol. 1, April 1976. Los Angeles, California, Departmento de Español y Portugués, University of California, Los Angeles 90024.

Miquiztli; Un Cuaderno de Arte, Poesía, Cuentos y Canto, Vol. 1, Fall 1972.

Published intermittently by the Chicano community (Chicano Press) at Stanford University, c/o Chicano Fellows (the Nitery), Stanford, California 94305.

National Association of Chicano Social Science; Newsletter.

Occasional newsletter published during academic year 1974-1975 by the Center of Mexican American Studies, University of Texas, Austin.

NCHO; Salud y Revolucion Social, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1972.

Newsletter published by the National Chicano Health Organization, National Office, 827 Sherman St., Denver, Colorado 80302. Formerly published in Los Angeles, California.

Newsletter. National Association of Chicano Social Scientists.

Chairman Professor Carlos Muñoz, Comparative Cultures Department, University of California, Irvine. Irvine, California 92664.

The Rican; A Journal of Contemporary Puerto Rican Thought, published by The Rican Journal, Inc., P.O. Box 11039, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

Books and Monographs

Alvarado, Roger, et al. La Raza! Why a Chicano Party? Why Chicano Studies? Merit Pamphlet. New York, Pathfinder Press, 1972.

Arciniega, Tomás A. "The Adaptive Styles of the Mexican American Student." Excerpt from: Public Education's Response to the Mexican American Student. El Paso, Texas, Innovative Resources, Inc. 1971, pp. 21-25.

Blair, Philip M. Job Discrimination and Education - An Investment Analysis: A Case Study of Mexican Americans in Santa Clara County, California. New York, Praeger, 1972.

Burns, Ruth Aline Ketchum. "Model for a Career/Life-Planning Program for Mexican American College Students." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1973.

Cárdenas, Isaac. "Equality of Educational Opportunity: A Descriptive Study on Mexican American Access to Higher Education." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1974.

Casa de la Raza: Separatism or Segregation, Chicanos in Public Education. Hayward, California, Southwest Network, 1973.

Casavantes, Edward J. A New Look at the Attributes of the Mexican American. Albuquerque, New Mexico, Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., March 1969.

Chicano Alternative Education. Hayward, California, Southwest Network, 1973.

Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education. El Plan de Santa Barbara; A Chicano Plan for Higher Education. Santa Barbara, California, January 1971.

Collymore, Raymond Quintin. "A Survey of the Educational Aspirations and Cultural Needs of the Negro and Mexican American Students in Two Community Colleges in the State of Colorado." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1971.

Concilio Editorial Board. El Plan de Santa Bárbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education. Chicano Council on Higher Education. Oakland, California, La Causa Publications, 1969.

De Los Santos, Gilbert. "An Analysis of Strategies Used by Community Junior Colleges to Serve the Educational and Cultural Needs of Their Mexican American Students." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1972.

Ferrín, Richard I., Richard W. Jonsen, and Cesar M. Trimble. Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest. Higher Education Surveys Report No. 6. Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, July 1972.

Ford Foundation. Four Minorities and the Ph.D.: Ford Foundation Graduate Fellowships for Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians. New York, N.Y., October 1973.

Gamez, George López. "T-Groups as a Tool for Developing Trust and Cooperation Between Mexican American and Anglo American College Students." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1970.

García, Ernest Lucero. "A Comparative Study of Community College Mexican American and Anglo American Graduates and Dropouts." Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1974.

Gares, Vaughn Dale. "A Comparative Investigation of the Occupational Counseling Given to Mexican American and Anglo American Students Upon Entering the Community College." Doctoral Dissertation, United States International University, 1974.

Godoy, Charles Edward. "Variables Differentiating Mexican American College and High School Graduates." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1970.

Gómez-Quiñones, Juan. "To Leave to Hope or Chance: Proposition on Chicano Studies, 1974" in Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education, Hayward, California, 1974.

Gonzáles, Arnold. "Analysis of a Challenge Program in Relation to Entry and Success of Mexican American Students in Higher Education and the Effect on Their Self-Image, Attitude Toward Education and Degree of Community Participation." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1974.

Gordon, Edward W., and Doxey A. Wilkerson. Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged: Programs and Practices, Preschool Through College. New York; College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Hernández, Armand Patrick. "An Exploratory Field Study of the Relationship Between Pre-Service Mexican American Law Enforcement Students and the Educational Community at San José City College." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1974.

Hernández, Deluvina. Mexican American Challenge to a Sacred Cow. Los Angeles, Aztlan Publications, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970.

Hernández, John Lawrence. "The Perception of Students and Parents Toward College Advisement with Implications for Mexican Americans." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1973.

Howell, James Oliver. "A Comparison of Academic Characteristics and Predictability of Academic Success of Mexican American Students with That of Non-Mexican American Students at New Mexico State University." Doctoral Dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1971.

Jakobovits, Leon A., and Murray S. Miron, Eds. Readings in the Psychology of Language. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, New York; Doubleday & Co., 1968.

Johnson, Henry S., and William J. Hernández-M. Educating the Mexican American. Valley Forge, Judson Press, 1970.

Leman, Kevin Anderson, "Parental Attitudes Toward Higher Education and Academic Success Among Mexican American, Black and Anglo Economically Disadvantaged College Students." Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Arizona, 1974.

Lohman, Joseph D. Cultural Patterns in Urban Schools. Berkeley, California, University of California, 1967.

López, Richard Emilio. "An Investigation of the Interrelationships Between Skin Color, Skin Color Preference, and Acculturation - Assimilation Among Chicano College Students." Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Arizona, 1974.

López, Ronald W., Arturo Madrid-Barela, and Reynaldo Flores Macías. Chicano In Higher Education: Status And Issues, Monograph No. 7. Los Angeles, Chicano Studies Center, Publications, University of California, Los Angeles, 1976.

Manuel, Herschel Thurman. Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest: Their Education and Public Welfare. University of Texas, Austin, 1965.

McGuire, John Burnett. "The Riesman Typology and Mexican American Junior College Students." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1970.

Minority Enrollment and Representation in Institutions of Higher Education; A Survey of Minority Student Enrollment in Colleges, Universities, Graduate Schools and Professional Schools in 50 States and the District of Columbia, New York, N.Y., Urban Education Inc., 1973.

Study commissioned by the Ford Foundation. Source of Data: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Population, 1970.

Mittlebach, Frank G., and Grace Marshall. The Burden of Poverty. Advance Report No. 5 of the Mexican American Study Project, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles, July 1966.

Murray, Wayne Robert. "Ethnic and Sex Differences as Related to Student Perceptions of a University Environment." Doctoral Dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1972.

Padilla, Raymond V. "Chicano Studies at the University of California, Berkeley: En Busca del Campus y la Communidad." Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1974.

Parr, Eunice. A Comparative Study of Mexican and American Children in the Schools of San Antonio, Texas. San Francisco, California, R and E Research Associates, 1972.

Poblano, Ralph (RAFA). Ghosts in the Barrio. Issues in Bilingual-Bicultural Education. Leswing Press, San Rafael, California, 1973.

Poulter, Virgil Leroy. "A Phonological Study of the Speech of Mexican American College Students Native to Fort Worth - Dallas." Doctoral Dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1973.

Prieto, Muriel H. "An Experimental Study of the Value of Teaching Certain Word Roots and Prefixes Through Spanish-English Equivalents to Native Spanish-speaking Students of English as a Second Language at the College Level." Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University, 1973.

Putnam, Howard L. "The Relation of College Programs of Community Services to the Needs of the Spanish-speaking People." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1956.

Ramírez, Manuel, III. Potential Contributions by the Behavioral Sciences to Effective Preparation Programs for Teachers of Mexican American Children. Las Cruces: Educational Research Information Center, New Mexico State University, February 1969.

Rudolph, James Edward. "Self-Perceived and Ascribed Characteristics of Mexican American, Anglo, and Bicultural College Students." Doctoral Dissertion, St. John's University, 1972.

Santiago, Ramón Luis. "A Contrastive Analysis of Some Rhetorical Aspects in the Writing in Spanish and English of Spanish-speaking College Students in Puerto Rico." Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1970.

Sarracino, Louise R. "An Experimental Study to Determine Effects of a Beginning College Speech Course Upon Personality Test Scores and Speech Proficiency Ratings of Twenty Mexican Americans." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1954.

Silliman, Janet Caroline. "Academic Achievement of Mexican American Females in a College of Nursing." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Arizona, 1974.

Stert, Madelon D., William R. Hazard, and Harry N. Rivilin. Cultural Pluralism in Education: A Mandate for Change. New York: Appleton-Century Crafts, 1973.

Ulibarri, Horacio. Educational Needs of the Mexican American. Las Cruces: Educational Research Information Center, New Mexico State University, April 1968.

Articles and Periodical Literature

Acuña, Rodolfo. "On Chicano Studies." La Raza, Vol. 1, No. 10, February 1973.

Amaya, Abel. "On Chicanos in Higher Education." La Luz, Vol. 3, No. 3, 1974, pg. 4.

Atencio, Tomás. "La Academic de la Nueva Raza: El Oro del Barrio." El Cuaderno, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1973, pp. 4-15.

Atencio, Tomás. "La Academia de la Nueva Raza: Su Historia." El Cuaderno, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1972, pp. 6-13.

Atencio, Tomás. "La Academia de la Nueva Raza: Sus Obras." El Cuaderno, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1972, pp. 6-13.

Ballesteros, David. "Meeting Instructional Needs for Chicano Students." NCRIEEO Newsletter, Vol. 3, No. 3, February 1972.

Betances, Samuel. "Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans in Higher Education." The Rican, Vol. 1, No. 4, May 1974, pp. 27-36.

Carbello-Argandoña, Roberto. "Recruitment of Spanish-speaking Students in Library Schools." Library Journal, May 15, 1976.

Clayton, A. Stafford, et al. "Educational Policy Issues." Educational Studies, Vol. 1, No. 1, Fall 1970, pp. 43-52.

Dreyfuss, John. "Ethnic Studies in State Mostly Promises, Plans." Los Angeles Times, April 25, 1969.

D W. F. "U.S. Medical School Enrollments 1968-1969 Through 1972-1973." Journal of Medical Education, Vol. 48, March 1973.

Duling, John A. "The Use of the Miller Analogies Test as a Screening Device for Mexican American Graduate Students." Journal of the NAWDAC, Vol. 37, No. 3, Spring 1974, pp. 133-136.

Ed Centric: A Journal of Educational Change, October-November 1972.

Special double issue on Chicanos and schooling.

EPOCA, Vol. 1, No. 1, Winter 1971.

Special issue on Chicanos and higher education.

González, Gustavo. "An Analysis of Chicano Spanish and the Problem of Usage: A Critique of Chicano Spanish and Dialects and Education!" Aztlan, Vol. 3, No. 2, Fall 1972.

Haddox, John. "Chicano Studies: Why?" Nosotros, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1974.

Harvey, James. "Minorities and Advanced Degrees." Research Currents, ERIC Higher Education, June 1, 1972.

Inside the Beast, a Progressive Third World Voice, Vol. 1, No. 13, June 8, 1973.

Special Issue on Chicano Studies. San Diego, California.

Interracial Books for Children - Bulletin, Vol. 5, Nos. 7 and 8, January 1975.

Special double issue on Chicano materials and children's literature.

Janssen, Peter. "DQU Their Own Place in the Sun." Change, Vol. 5, No. 1, February 1973, pp. 45-48.

López, Manuel L. "The Role of the Chicano Student in the Chicano Studies Program." La Gente, Vol. 3, No. 4, February 27, 1973.

Macías, Reynaldo. "Developing a Bilingual, Culturally Relevant Educational Program for Chicanos." Aztlán, Vol. 4, No. 1, Spring 1973.

Macías, Reynaldo, et al. "Objectives of Chicano Studies." Epoca, Vol. 1, No. 1, Winter 1971.

Moreno, Steve. "Problems Related to Present Testing Instruments." El Grito, Vol. 3, No. 3, Spring 1970.

Nosotros, Vol. 2, No. 2, May 1972.

Pacific Historical Review, Vol. 42, No. 3, August 1973.

Special issue on Chicano History.

Peñalosa, Fernando. "Recent Changes Among the Chicanos." Sociology and Social Research, October 1970.

Article included in Pain and Promise, Ed. Edward Simmen, New York, New American Library, 1972.

Peñalosa, Fernando, and Edward C. McDonagh. "Education, Economic Status and Social Class Awareness of Mexican Americans." Phylon, Summer 1968, pp. 119-126.

Pesqueira, Richard E. "Mexican American Student 'staying' Power in College." College Board Review, Vol. 90, 1973-1974, pp. 6-9, 26, 28.

Ramírez, Manuel III. "The Relationship of Acculturation to Educational Achievement." El Grito, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1971, pp. 21-28.

Rivera, Julius. "The Implementation of Mexican American Studies in Texas Colleges and Universities. Epoca: The National Concilio for Chicano, Winter 1971.

Rochín, Refugio I. "The Short and Turbulent Life of Chicano Studies: A Preliminary Study of Emerging Programs and Problems." Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 53, No. 4, March 1973, pp. 884-894.

Samora, Julián, and Ernesto Galarza. "Research and Scholarly Activity." Epoca: The National Concilio for Chicano Studies Journal, Winter 1971, pp. 51-54.

Sánchez, Corinne. "Higher Education y La Chicana." Encuentro Femenil, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1973, pp. 27-33.

Sánchez, Lionel. "La Raza Community and Chicano Studies." Epoca: The National Concilio for Chicano Studies Journal, Winter 1971, pp. 18-22.

Schelter, H. "Teaching English to Mexican American Pupils." Today's Education, March 1972.

Seda Bonilla, Edurado. "Ethnic Studies and Cultural Pluralism." The Rican, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1971, pp. 56-65.

Sifuentes, Frank. "Mexican Americans and Higher Education in the Golden State." Regeneration, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1970, pp. 4-5.

Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 53, No. 4, 1975.

Special issue on the Chicano experience in the U.S.

Vásquez, James. "Measurement of Intelligence and Language Differences." Aztlán, Vol. 3, No. 1, Fall 1972.

Vásquez, Richard. "Chicano Course Holds Mirror to Others, Too." Los Angeles Times, June 17, 1970.

Wilde, Richard H. "The Establishment of a Chicano Studies Program and its Relation to the Total Curriculum of a College or University." The National Concilio for Chicano Studies Journal, Vol. 1, No. 2, Winter 1971, pp. 70-78.

Government Publications and Unpublished Documents, and Papers

Abrahams, Peter D. "EOP in the California Community Colleges, 1970: Perspectives on Programs, Evaluation of a Training Program." Berkeley, KARDI Corporation.

A report prepared for the Rio Hondo College.

"Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest. Report of Action Conferences, July 31 - August 4, 1972." Southwestern Committee for Higher Education, Survey No. 6, 1972.

"ACR 78: Recognizing the Contributions of Ethnic Minorities," (mimeographed). Agenda Item D prepared under staff direction of Russell L. Reise, Chief, Higher Education Specialist, October 3, 1972.

Acuña, Rodolfo. "Chicano Studies: Successes and Failures." Speech. Boise Idaho, January 7, 1974, unpublished message, n.d.

"Admissions Study Digest, A Summary of the California State Colleges, 1963 Admissions Study--Phase 1."

A report prepared for the Division of Institutional Research, The California State Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, April 1969.

Altman, Robert A., and Patricia O. Snyder. "The Minority Student on Campus: Expectations and Possibilities." Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley and Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, November 1970.

American Bar Association. "Law School and Bar Admission Requirements," in A Review of Legal Education in the United States, Fall 1973 Chicago, American Bar Association, 1974.

American Council on Education. "The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1971-1974." Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles, ACE Research Reports.

American Dental Association. Division of Educational Measurements. "Minority Student Enrollment and Opportunities in U.S." in Dental School Annual Report, Dental Education Supplement 1972/1973, American Dental Association, Division of Educational Measurements.

"Annual Report of the United Scholarship Service Inc., 1969." United Scholarship Service, Inc., Denver, Colorado, 1969.

Armendariz, Juan. "Social Work Education for Economically Disadvantaged Groups in Texas. Final Report, July 1, 1970 - August 31, 1973." Consortium of Texas Schools of Social Work, Austin, August 31, 1973.

Astin, Alexander W., et al. "The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1973." Los Angeles, University of California, American Council on Education, Comparative Institutional Research Program, 1973.

Brace, Clayton, et al. "Federal Programs to Improve Mexican American Education." Washington, D.C., U.S. Office of Education, 1967.

Cabrera, Y. Arturo. "A Survey of Spanish-surname Enrolled Students, San Jose State College 1963-1964." San Jose State College, California, 1964.

"California Higher Education and the Disadvantaged: A Status Report." Revised for Presentation to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, February 19, 1968.

California State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights. "Education and the Mexican American Community in Los Angeles County." April 1968.

California State Department of Education. "A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975."

A report prepared for the Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California. Sacramento, California, 1960.

Californians of Spanish-surname: Population; Employment; Income; Education."

A mimeographed report prepared by the Human Relations Agency, Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Fair Employment Practices. San Francisco: May 1964.

Carter, Thomas P. "Mexican Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect." New York, College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Castañeda, Alfredo, Manuel Ramirez III, Carlos E. Cortés, and Mario Barrera, Eds. Mexican Americans and Educational Change. New York, Symposium at the University of California, Riverside, May 21-22, 1971, Proceedings of Arno Press, 1974.

Chavarría, Jesús. "Chicano Studies," n.d., n.p.

Commission on Human Resources. "Minority Groups Among United States Doctorate-level Scientists, Engineers, and Scholars, 1973." National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, 1974.

Cornejo, Ricardo J. "A Synthesis of Theories and Research on the Effects of Teaching in First and Second Languages: Implications for Bilingual Education." New Mexico State University, University Park. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, June 1974.

Edington, Everett D., Frank Angel. "Recruitment of Spanish-speaking Students into Higher Education." Washington, D.C., U.S. Office of Education, May 1969.

"Educational Opportunity Programs 1970-1971."

A report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the California State University and Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, Division of Student Affairs, July 1972.

Elizondo, Sergio D. "Critical Areas of Need for Research and Scholastic Study." Washington, D.C., Chicano Studies Institutes, 1970.

El-Khawas, Elaine H., and Joan L. Kinzer. "Enrollment of Minority Graduate Students at Ph.D. - Granting Institutions, Higher Education Panel Report No. 19." Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1974.

Ferrín, Richard I., Richard W. Jonsen, and César M. Trimble. "Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest." Higher Education Surveys, Report No. 6, College Entrance Examination Board, Palo Alto, California, July 1972.

"Final Report of University of Utah Committee on Women's Education." Salt Lake City, University of Utah, February 1970.

"Five Years Later: A Follow-up to the California State Colleges 1963 Admissions Study--Phase II." Monograph No. 3.

The California State Colleges. Division of Institutional Research, Office of the Chancellor, April 1970.

Franklin, Mayer J., et al. "Proceedings of the Conference of Increasing Opportunities for Mexican American Students in Higher Education, May 15-17." Los Angeles Harbor College, May 1969.

García, Larry. "Chicano Universities in the Southwest: A Focus on Formation, Purpose and Program." Unpublished message, n.d.

Gómez, Angel I. "Mexican Americans in Higher Education." Paper presented at Symposium on Mexican American Education, Society for Applied Anthropology Meeting, April 12-14, 1973, Tucson, Arizona, April 15, 1973.

Gómez, Anna Nieto, and J. Anthony Vásquez. "The Needs of the Chicano on the College Campus.: U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., May 1969.

Gómez-Quiñones, Juan. "To Leave to Hope or Chance: Propositions on Chicano Studies, 1974." Unpublished message, n.d.

Guerra, Manuel H., et al. "The Retention of Mexican American Students in Higher Education with Special Reference to Bicultural and Bilingual Problems." California State College, Long Beach. U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., May 1969.

Guerra, Manuel H. "What are the Objectives of Chicano Studies?" Washington, D.C., Chicano Studies Institutes, 1970.

"Intercultural Studies in the Public Community Colleges of California."

A report to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges; prepared by Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, Berkeley, California, 1971.

"Institutions of Higher Education 1970, Constituent Institutions of 1970." Unpublished Report, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Karr, Ken, and Esther McGuire. "Mexican Americans on the Move--Are Teacher Preparation Programs in Higher Education Ready?" RI E 69, December 1969.

Kitano, Harry H. L., and Dorothy L. Miller. "An Assessment of Educational Opportunity Programs in California Higher Education."

A report prepared for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Council Report 70-1. San Francisco, California: Scientific Analysis Corporation, 1970.

Knowlton, Clark S. "Spanish-speaking People of the Southwest."

A report prepared for the Department of Sociology, University of Texas, El Paso, March 31, 1967.

"Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School."

Special report and recommendations by The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Hightstown, New Jersey, McGraw-Hill Company, January 1971.

López, Ronald W., and Darryl D. Enos. "Chicanos and Public Higher Education in California."

Report prepared for the California Legislature, Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, Sacramento, California, California Legislature, December, 1972.

Los Angeles County. Regional Planning Commission, Quarterly Bulletin, No. 116, April 1, 1972, Los Angeles, California

Martyn, Kenneth. "California Higher Education and the Disadvantaged: A Status Report." California State Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento, March 1968.

Méndez, Aida, and Caroline Lee, Eds. "Trends Conference on Education of the Mexican American in San Diego County." San Diego University, May 13, 1967.

"The Mexican American, a New Focus on Opportunity; Testimony Presented at the Cabinet Committee Hearings on Mexican American Affairs, El Paso, Texas, October 26-28, 1967," Washington, D.C., Interagency Committee on Mexican American Affairs, 1969.

Murray, Wayne R., and Timothy J. Pettibone. "Mexican American and Anglo Perceptions of a University Environment." RIE 73 June, November 17, 1972.

National Academy of Sciences. National Research Council. "Doctorate Records File, 1974."

National Education Association. "The Invisible Minority: Report of the NEA-Tucson Survey on the Teaching of Spanish to the Spanish-speaking." Washington, D.C., Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1966.

National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences. "Minority Groups Among United States Doctorate-Level Scientists, Engineers, and Scholars, 1973." Washington, D.C., 1974.

Newman, Frank, et al. "Report on Higher Education." A report prepared for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, March 1971.

Nuñez, René, Comp. "A Proposal of Guidelines for Reordering Educational Processes of Recruitment and Admissions." Washington, D.C., U.S. Office of Education, May 1969.

Office of Undergraduate Recruitment and Development. University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, 1972-1973.

Brochure of general information regarding special programs for the recruitment and selection of disadvantaged persons at UCLA.

Ornelas, Charles, et al. "Decolonizing the Interpretation of the Chicano Political Experience." Pamphlet No. 2, Publications Unit, Chicano Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles, 1975.

"Programs for Minority/Disadvantaged Students." Princeton, New Jersey, Report of an Initial Survey, Bruce Hamilton Testing Service, 1973.

Ramirez, Salvador. "UMAS." Boulder, Colorado, 1972.

"A Report of the University of New Mexico's College Enrichment Program." New Mexico University, Albuquerque, October 15, 1971.

Rodríguez, Antonio. "On Chicano Studies." Unpublished message. Los Angeles, California, 1974.

Rodríguez, Armando. "Financial Assistance of Mexican American Students in Higher Education." Washington, D.C., U.S. Office of Education, May 1969.

Sánchez, George I. "Concerning Segregation of Spanish-speaking Children in the Public Schools." Occasional Papers, IX, University of Texas at Austin, December 1951.

Sánchez, Rodolfo B. "A Chicano Perspective on Social Work Curriculum Development. Social work Education for Economically Disadvantaged Groups in Texas. An Occasional paper of the Consortium of Texas Schools of Social Work." University of Texas, Austin, August 1972.

"Summary Profile: Fall 1969 Upper Division Transfer Students with Intra-System Observations." Technical Memorandum No. 5. Division of Institutional Research, Office of the Chancellor, California State Colleges, August 1971.

"Summer Preparatory Institute, 1968, University of Denver, College Law." Report. Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y., September 1968.

"Those Who Made It: Selected Characteristics of the June 1967 California State College Baccalaureate Graduates." Monograph No. 1. Division of Institutional Research, Office of the Chancellor, The California State Colleges, January 1969.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. "The Unfinished Education. Outcomes for Minorities in the Five Southwestern States: Mexican American." Report II, Washington, D.C., October 1971.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1972." Washington, D.C., 1975.

U.S. Office for Civil Rights. "Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data From Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1970." OCR-72-8. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

U.S. Office for Civil Rights. "Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data From Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1972. OCR-74-13, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1974.

WAGS-WICHE Committee on Graduate Education of Ethnic Minority Students. "Graduate Education and Ethnic Minorities." Western Association of Graduate Schools and Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, February 1970.

Zuñiga, Alfred I. and Barbara Rigby-Acosta. "A Study of the Nature of Chicano Studies Derived from Twelve Proposals for Chicano Studies Written Between 1968 and 1974: A Tentative Description," in Perspectives on Chicano Education; edited by Tokias and Sandra Gonzales, Chicano Fellows, Stanford, California, 1975.

Chicano Studies Center Publications